

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XVI.—No. 63.

JULY, 1940.

RONALD BRUNLEES MCKERROW

RONALD BRUNLEES MCKERROW died on January 20, 1940. He had been seriously ill for many months, but his friends had always hoped that he would recover, and his death was a shock to many. No man will be more sorely missed by all who are concerned with English studies, and especially by the many students and research workers of a younger generation whom he helped so ungrudgingly.

McKerrow was born on December 12, 1872. He was educated at Harrow, where he started as a classic, but went over to the modern side, as it was his father's wish that he should study for his own profession of engineer. From Harrow he passed, without reluctance, to King's College, London; but in 1894 he was enabled to go up to Cambridge and for the first year he read for the Engineering Tripos. His natural inclination, however, was for literature, and after winning the Chancellor's English Medal in 1895 he changed over to the Modern Language Tripos, reading English and French. He took a Second Class in 1897.

On coming down from Cambridge McKerrow went out to Japan as Professor of English in the Government School of Foreign Languages at Tokyo. He stayed in Japan for three years, seeing much of the country and liking the people. In 1900 he returned to England and became friendly with A. H. Bullen, with whom he was associated for a while in editing the *Gentleman's Magazine*.

For the next ten years he was at work accumulating his vast

knowledge of the Elizabethan period, which resulted in his edition of Nashe (of which Bullen published the first four volumes) and of a number of minor publications. Meanwhile in 1908 the publishing firm of Sidgwick and Jackson was formed, and McKerrow became one of the original directors, though as yet he was not an active partner.

During these years in London he was a keen theatre-goer, and was especially attracted by the Granville-Barker productions, particularly of Shakespeare's plays at the Savoy. In later years Sidgwick and Jackson were responsible for the publication of Granville-Barker's *Prefaces to Shakespeare*.

McKerrow returned to academic teaching during the war of 1914-18 and became Lecturer in English Literature at King's College, London; where afterwards he was appointed Honorary Lecturer in Bibliography. He was, however, not at his best as a lecturer. Meanwhile, in 1917 R. C. Jackson, the junior partner in the firm of Sidgwick and Jackson, was killed in the war, and McKerrow was invited to take a more active part in the business. Thenceforward he became joint managing director with Frank Sidgwick. Their association lasted until Sidgwick's death in August 1939.

From 1912 to 1934 he was secretary of the Bibliographical Society with Dr. A. W. Pollard; thereafter he was sole secretary, and editor of *The Library*, until Mr. F. C. Francis, of the British Museum, was chosen to assist him. He was Sanders Reader in Bibliography in the University of Cambridge in 1928, and had received the degree of Litt.D. from the University of Cambridge in 1911; and in the following year the Bibliographical Society honoured him with its Gold Medal. In 1932 he became a fellow of the British Academy.

Of McKerrow's many contributions to English studies, five are of prime importance: the edition of *The Works of Thomas Nashe* (1904-10), the *Dictionary of Printers, 1558-1640* (1910), *The Review of English Studies*, which he founded in 1925, *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students* (1927), and the *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* (1939).

"McKerrow's Nashe" by any standard is a work to which the well-worn labels "landmark" and "monumental" can justly be fixed. It is the finest specimen of the editing of an English author that has yet been produced, a pattern of how scholarly work should be planned, performed, and completed. McKerrow realized that

Nashe's writings have a value not merely for students of literature or for philologists, but for "all those who for any reason wish to realize the times of the Elizabethans as they were indeed." He therefore designed an edition to satisfy the needs of any reader. To produce a text which should be as accurate as possible, he was led to a minute study and collation of various editions on a scale at that time seldom attempted by editors of English texts, and thence to the value of bibliographical research. The notes were full and fascinating: it is a common experience that the reader on referring to some passage in the familiar fourth volume forgets his original quest to go on reading, entranced by the amazing mass of miscellaneous information and the occasional privy wink for the discerning at some salty passage; for in the right company McKerrow enjoyed a good story. The fifth volume (Introduction and Index) worthily completed the whole. It was concerned not only with Nashe himself, but with every odd event in which that vigorous young reprobate mingled. It gives the best survey of the Martin Marprelate affair, the Harvey family, and the quarrel of Gabriel with Greene's gang. McKerrow was always just, fair, and judicious; his instinct was to be counsel for the defendant. His defence of Gabriel Harvey is a shrewd study of character; and he had even a kind and grateful word for the unjustly maligned memory of Alexander Grosart.

In January 1925 appeared the first number of *The Review of English Studies*, which McKerrow continued to edit and publish till his death. It was the best printed and produced of all the learned publications devoted to English subjects; and, like everything that he designed, distinguished by intelligent imagination. The *Review* included from the first a summary of articles and notes of interest appearing in other periodicals, and it reprinted the honours lists in English from the various British universities.

Moreover, McKerrow gave a wide interpretation to English studies. Research, he wrote in the opening editorial, "is the life-blood of literary history;" but, he went on, "those who have planned this Review would use the name of research, in the sense of interpretation of material as well as that of amassing it; for though all honour is due to the laborious compiler of fact upon fact, a view of research which ranges no further than this misses in their opinion all that is best in it and most worthy of effort. This Review will therefore welcome new facts—however disconnected and in them-

selves seemingly unimportant they may be—but it will welcome no less cordially attempts to weave such facts into a larger unity, to interpret them in the light of their own time and of ours, and to place them in their true relation to the knowledge that we already possess." Further, it was his aim to help the beginner by printing from time to time "special articles intended to afford such instruction and information as may be useful to young students."

It will hardly be denied by anyone who looks through the files of the *Review* that the earlier numbers were more interesting than the later. This, however, was not due to any failure or change in the editor, but rather to the increasing specialization in English, as in all forms of study. It was McKerrow's general policy to give preference to the work of the young and the unknown scholar; and he took endless pains in suggesting and improving immature work that it might appear to the best advantage. Indeed, his last contribution to the *Review* was a general exhortation to young research workers to use common sense and simple language in presenting their arguments.

How willing he was to follow this good advice himself may be seen in everything that he wrote, but perhaps nowhere more clearly than in his *Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. Here an intricate subject has been made to appear simple without any shirking of difficult issues or taking refuge in partial explanations. It might fairly be said of McKerrow that he brought bibliography down from heaven to inhabit among men. In this field particularly he showed himself an admirable teacher; he remembered things that had once puzzled him, and set himself to explain them to others, and for all the fascination that the subject held for him he never thought of bibliography as a mistress, but as a handmaid, invaluable, and indeed essential to literary study. The *Introduction to Bibliography* has left the literary student with small excuse for abandoning all bibliographical problems to the specialist.¹

McKerrow's last important publication was a study in editorial method, *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*, which appeared early in 1939. As is generally known, for the past nine years or more he had been working on a new text of Shakespeare's

¹ A more comprehensive account of this and of McKerrow's other bibliographical work is given by Mr. Harold Williams in *The Library*, 4th Series, Vol. XX., No. 4, March, 1940.

works, to be published by the Oxford University Press, and in this preliminary volume he considered and set down the principles which were to guide him. Although he was the most expert of bibliographers, he rejected wholeheartedly the view "that the recovery of the texts of previous centuries is purely or even mainly a matter of bibliography or of linguistics, useful or even necessary as these 'sciences' are in their places, or that by methods of textual criticism we can ever arrive at certainty in the solution of our textual problems." Indeed, he became almost vituperative in his condemnation of pseudo-scientific methods and romantic detective work. The *Prolegomena* is a clear, common-sense survey of the editor's problems by one who was not only a scholar, but also a publisher with considerable experience of all the processes of book making. McKerrow always wrote with admirable lucidity, and here in particular he makes his points with a precision and an easy confidence that delight the reader. At the time of his death the text of nine plays was actually in type, and there is good hope that the edition will be completed according to the principles laid down in the *Prolegomena*.

In appearance McKerrow looked an open-air man: one would have expected to hear that he was a farmer or a retired naval officer. He was naturally shy and inclined to be silent. To those who venerated his learning, but were ignorant of his nature, at first meeting he was rather frightening; but not for long. No one was kinder or took so much trouble to encourage and to help beginners. Most of the younger scholars in English owe something to him, but probably he was too modest to realize the very real affection they felt for him. In McKerrow's death they mourn the loss, not only of a fine scholar, but also of a great friend to English scholarship.

G. B. HARRISON.

WILLIAM BRETON, NICHOLAS BRETON, AND GEORGE GASCOIGNE

BY FITZGERALD FLOURNOY

EVER since Grosart published the will of William Breton in 1879,¹ it has been understood that the father of Nicholas Breton was well to do. Furthermore, he left to Nicholas, his second son, land in Essex and Lincolnshire, together with personal property of some value. Yet Nicholas became a hack writer, nearly fifty of whose works for popular consumption are preserved, and throughout those works he utters continual complaints of poverty, which seem more than conventional by their poignant sense of the tragedy of poverty, the power of riches, and the callousness of the rich.² How did William Breton, a younger son who came up to London from Essex, make his fortune, and why did his son Nicholas, well provided for in the will, suffer poverty and write pamphlets for a living? Was Nicholas Breton's step-father, the poet George Gascoigne, to blame? These are the questions to which I propose to give some answer in this paper.

The first question was answered in a general and conjectural way by Grosart when he concluded that William Breton had gone into trade in London and grown rich thereby.³ The first specific answer, however, was made by Miss Florence Teager, who in 1931 published in the *Review of English Studies* an account of five documents found by her in the Ryerson collection of Bacon papers at the University of Chicago.⁴ One document records the acquisition of large properties, formerly belonging to the Priory of St. Mary's without Bishopsgate, by William Breton and Nicholas Bacon. The other four documents are records of sales, which attest the joint

¹ Grosart, A. B., *Works of Nicholas Breton* (Chertsey Worthies Library, privately printed), 1879. I. xii-xviii.

² Cf. *Wits Trenchmour* (1597), in Grosart, II. 13, 18; *A Scholler and a Souldier* (1599), *ibid.*, II. 24; *Grimello's Fortunes* (1604), *ibid.*, II. 8; *An Olde Man's Lesson* (1605), *ibid.*, II. 6; *Pasquils Mad-Cappe* (1600), *ibid.*, I. 5, 7, 8.

³ *Ibid.*, I. xviii.

⁴ Teager, F. E., "Note on George Gascoigne and his Circle," *Review of English Studies*, VII (1931), pp. 330-1.

ownership by Bacon and Breton of some properties in the parish of St. Peter's, Cornhill, London. Miss Teager draws the justified conclusion that the documents she has found "supplement concretely Grosart's position" that William Breton came up to London and engaged in trade.

Before I saw Miss Teager's article I had discovered, in publications of the Public Record Office, viz. *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII* and the *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, summaries of no less than thirteen documents which record the acquirement of property by "William Breton of London." I find, from the same sources, that there are six documents recording the sale of property by William Breton, some of it sold the day after its acquisition. Virtually all the acquisitions come from the confiscated property of the church, through the Court of Augmentations, and the quick sales speak eloquently of speculation.

But William Breton did not sell all his land, as a modern speculator might do. The offspring of country gentry, he evidently wanted to leave a landed estate, and I find, by a comparison of the acquisitions of property with the will of William Breton, that thirteen of the bequests of the will are explained by acquisitions of property recorded in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls* and the *Letters and Papers*. So much for a condensed statement of my findings. A more detailed statement, with references, follows.

ACQUISITIONS OF PROPERTY.

1. "Grant to Nic. Bacon, solicitor of augmentations, Wm. Breton, and Hon. Asshefyld" of property in London, June 23, 36 Henry VIII (1544). This grant names twenty-three pieces of property in nineteen parishes, "all which premises belonged to the late priory or new hospital of St. Mary without Bishopsgate."¹

The document recording acquisition 1 is evidently another copy of the document recording an acquisition by Breton and Bacon which Miss Teager found in the Ryerson collection. There are two slight discrepancies, which may be accounted for as errors, either of one or the other of the manuscripts or of the P.R.O. *Letters and Papers*. The discrepancies are as follows:

(a) Miss Teager gives the former owner of the property as "the

¹ P.R.O. *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII*, arranged and catalogued by James Gairdner and R. H. Brodie, 1880-1932, xx (1545), Part ii. 665.

priory of the new hospital of the blessed Mary." The version of acquisition 1 as given in the *Letters and Papers*, has the much more reasonable wording, "the *late* priory or *new* hospital of St. Mary" (*italics mine*).

(b) Miss Teager gives the date as June 23, 1545. *Letters and Papers* give the date as June 23, 36 Henry VIII, which is certainly 1544.¹

These discrepancies are, in my opinion, of the sort which tends to prove rather than disprove the identity of the grants described in the document at Chicago and that in the Public Record Office.

It may be noted in passing that "Nic. Bacon" is almost certainly the Sir Nicholas Bacon who was to be Elizabeth's Lord Keeper and father of Francis Bacon, and whose political acumen was doubtless of decisive aid in helping William Breton to obtain this first block of the confiscated church property. Breton married an Elizabeth Bacon, daughter of John Bacon, and while her relationship to Sir Nicholas and his famous son has never been categorically proved, this evidence of business association between Breton and Bacon makes the relationship seem more probable.²

In any case, this grant indicates that William Breton was on good terms with the most successful of the Bacons, who like himself, had come to town as an obscure country gentleman to make his fortune.

2. A grant to "John Maynerd and William Breton" for £755 4s. 3d., of numerous properties in St. Albans, Herts, and in Worcestershire, Bucks, Northants, Yorks, and Lincs, all formerly the property of St. Albans Monastery; also a tenement in High Holborn, formerly of the Charterhouse, June 29 and July 5, 1544. Under the head of "all such sums as is rising to your Majesty of the lands bargained and sold by the commission" there is reported, as of August 1544, "William Breton, 66l."³

3. A grant to Thomas Herbert of "Wimoscowe", Monm., and William Breton, for £517 8s. 4d., of twenty-nine messuages and

¹ See Fry, E. A., *Almanachs for Students of English History*, London, 1915, p. 120.

² Ward, B. M., "George Gascoigne and his Circle," *Review of English Studies*, II. (1926), p. 38, publishes a pedigree by which Elizabeth is the first cousin once removed of Sir Nicholas Bacon and the second cousin of Francis Bacon. Ward, however, gives no authority for the pedigree, and I have not been able to find it in any of the visitations of Norfolk or Suffolk seats of the Bacon family, which are available to me.

³ P.R.O. *Letters and Papers*, XIX. (1544). i. 621-2.

tenements scattered through the counties of Monmouthshire, Hunts, Cambridge, Salop, Norfolk, and Lincolnshire, the town of Cambridge, and the City of London, and representing the property of seven religious houses as well as one property "bought by the King," July 1545.¹

4. A lease for twenty-one years to "William Breton of London" of "Kedyngton Rectory," Lincs, formerly the property of "Alvyngham" (monastery?). October 16, 1545.²

5. A lease for twenty-one years to "William Breton," by advice of Southwell and Moyle, of "the rectory of Wyckes, Essex, parcel of the lands of Thomas Wolcey, Cardinal, attained." October 27, 38 Henry VIII (1546).³

This acquisition may be at least one of "all those my landes and ten(emen)tes in Wykes in the Countie of Essex" ⁴ which William Breton left to his second son, Nicholas.

6. A lease for twenty-one years to "William Breton of London" of the rectory of "Hotofte", Lincolnshire, on surrender of a crown lease (recited) to "Hen Swyte, vicar of Hotofte, 13 May, 31 Henry VIII. 6 October." ⁵ The entry occurs in the *Books of the Court of Augmentations*, 1546-7. Either May or October of 31 Henry VIII is in 1539.

7. A patent, in consideration of £606 9s. 0½d., "paid in the Augmentations by the King's servant, Richard Goodricke, esq., Attorney of the Augmentations, and William Breton of London, gentleman," to 104 properties, most of them in Lincolnshire, but a few in Hunts and a few in London: August 6, 1548.⁶ Among the properties enumerated is a messuage and forty-four acres in "Brugh and Skegnes," Lincs. This seems to be the bequest made in the will to Nicholas Breton of "all that my manor of Burgh in the marshe wth thappurtenances in the countie of Lyncoln."⁷

8. A patent "for £1,744 19s., paid in the Augmentations by William Breton of London, gentleman, and Humphrey Luce of London, letherseller," to seventy-eight properties, more than a third of them in London, the rest in the counties of Caermarthen, Somerset, Pembroke, Brecknock, Radnor, Dorset, and Wilts. May 4, 1549.⁸

¹ *Ibid.*, xx (1545). i. 665.

² *Ibid.*, xx (1545). i. 681.

³ *Ibid.*, xxi (1547). ii. 165. Sir Richard Southwell was a Commissioner of Augmentations. *Ibid.*, ii (1545). i. 665.

⁴ See Note 1 above.

⁵ *Letters and Papers*, xxi (1546). ii. 439.

⁶ P.R.O. *Calendar of Patent Rolls* (Edw. IV), London, 1924-9, iv (1550-3). 68.

⁷ *Grosart*, i. xiv.

⁸ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, ii (1548-9), pp. 32-5.

9. A patent, for £449 4s. 6d., "paid in the Augmentations by William Breton of London and Ambrose Nicholas of London, salter," to fifty-three properties, nine in Cardiff, ten in the City of Hereford, seven in Lincolnshire, and the rest scattered over Anglesey, County Caermarthen, County Radnor, and London. Yearly value, £39 3s. 5d. December 23, 1549.¹

10. A licence, for 46s. 8d., "to Edward Fynez, knt., lord Clynton and Saye, Great Admiral of England, to grant his manor of Woneford, Devon, late of Margaret late Countess of Salisbury, attainted, to Richard Sackville, knt., Chancellor of Augmentations, William Breton, gentleman, and assigns of the said Richard." June 11, 1550.²

11. A licence, "for 6s. 8d., to William Dyxe of London, gent., to grant his tenement and adjacent garden . . . in the parish of St. Giles without crepulgate, London, late of the charterhouse, . . . to William Bretton of London, gentleman, his heirs and assigns." December 4, 1551.³

The acquisition described in the paragraph above is almost certainly that of the house in which William Breton established his residence, in which Nicholas Breton was born, and which is described in the will as "The Chieff Capitall Mansion house in Redcrosstrete in the . . . parish of saynt Gyles w^{out} Creplegate . . . wherein I nowe inhabitt . . . togeather wth the gardeyn Ten(emen)tes and all other thappurtenn(an)ces" . . . purchased of William Dixe, gent."⁴

12. A patent "for £1,596 7s. 8d., paid to Edmund Peckham, knt., to the king's use, by Thomas Browne and William Breton of London, gentleman," to sixty-seven properties in London and sixteen of the counties. Yearly value, £65 12s. 4d. March 25, 1553.⁵

13. A patent, for £1,331 18s. 1d., "paid to Edmund Peckham, knt., to the king's use, by William Webb, esq. and William Breton of London, gentleman," to fifty-four pieces of property, twenty-two in the city of Hereford, others scattered over seven counties, and certain others of especial interest, as follows:

(a) "The land within the walls of Christ's College, Cambridge, in tenure of the master and fellows of that college, late of the priory of Whyte Chanons in Cambridge."

¹ *Ibid.*, III (1549-51), p. 350.

² *Ibid.*, III (1549-51), p. 350.

³ *Ibid.*, IV (1550-3), p. 68.

⁴ *Grosart*, I. xiii.

⁵ *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, v (1553), pp. 157-60.

(b) The parcel of land called "a garden plott" in the town of Cambridge in tenure of the master and fellows of St. Peter's College, commonly called Peterhouse, in that town, and

(c) "The parcel of land within the walls of the college of St. Benedict, commonly called Bennett Colledge, in tenure of the master and fellows of that college, late of the same White Chanons" and

(d) "The yearly rent of 13s. 14d. payable to the late priory of Tyltey, Essex, by the master and fellows of Christ's College, Cambridge, for land there. Yearly value, £54 8s." February 24, 1553.¹

An odd situation, this, brought about by the confiscation of church property. The land on which two Cambridge colleges are built, the garden of a third, and a property lease by a college from a religious house are all transferred to a London speculator. That the speculator appreciated his Cambridge holdings seems to be indicated by the fact that in his will he left five pounds to the poor of the town and ten pounds to "the poorest skoolers of the vniv'sitie . . .".²

The thirteen acquisitions of property listed above suggest four generalizations.

In the first place, Nicholas Breton's father was a richer man than we had realized. The thirteen acquisitions listed include 350 separate pieces of real estate in every part of England, and much of it in the metropolis. Some of this property, of course, was shared with fellow-beneficiaries.

In the second place, William Breton made his money not by "trade," as Grosart conjectured, but by acquiring confiscated property and reselling it with amazing speed, as we shall see presently.

In the third place, to fare so sumptuously at the trough of the Court of Augmentations Breton must have had political pull. Not only was he remarkably successful in acquiring the property formerly owned by religious houses and attainted persons, but three of the acquisitions were made in partnership with officers of the Court of Augmentations, viz. Nicholas Bacon, Solicitor of Augmentations, Richard Goodricke, Attorney of the Augmentations, and Richard Sackville, Knt., Chancellor of Augmentations. The terms of the licence for the acquisition of the property with Sackville

¹ *Ibid.*, v (1553), pp. 160-2.

² The will is published in *Grosart*, I. xii-xvii. It seems useless to give a citation every time it is quoted.

(Acquisition 10) suggest, moreover, that the property was really to go to Sackville and his assigns and that Breton was acting with him merely to fulfil a legal technicality—doing a favour, no doubt, in return for favours done him.

In the fourth place, it is noteworthy that William Breton is spoken of as "gentleman" or as "of London," never as belonging to a trade, though two of his partners in land-grabbing are "Ambrose Nicholas, Salter" and "Humphrey Luce, letherseller." To acquire the money for his purchases, William may have engaged previously in trade, but his careful avoidance of any mention of his trade with his name and his political pull are both in thorough accord with the generally accepted theory that he was a younger son of a country gentleman of Layer Breton in Essex.

It now remains to summarize six documents that record the sale of property by William Breton. Every sale can be identified as involving property mentioned in the acquisitions already summarized, and it is amazing how quickly this early business man turned over this property. When we find a piece of property sold the day after its acquisition from the crown, we are forced to the conclusion that there were wheels within wheels in this affair. The price paid to the crown was doubtless so low, thanks to Nicholas Bacon and other political connections, that the resale could realize a wide margin of profit even at a price low enough to be irresistible to buyers. The summarized records of sale follow, each sale identified with the corresponding acquisition.

SALES OF PROPERTY.

1. A grant by "John Maynard and William Breton to Isabella Best" of a tenement and lands in Hawkesworth, in the Parish of Otley, Yorks, formerly the property of Esseholt Priory. July 1544.¹

This property is named in the grant of acquisition 2. The land was acquired on June 29 and sold during July, a proof that it was bought to be sold.

2. A grant by "John Maynard and William Breton to Sir Ric. Lee" of six properties in St. Albans, formerly of St. Albans Monastery. August 1544.²

These properties are a part of acquisition 2. This sale was made the next month but one after acquisition.

¹ *Letters and Papers*, XIX (1544). i. 640.

² *Ibid.*, XIX (1544). ii. 87.

3. A grant by "John Maynard and William Breton" to "Thomas Vaughan, of St. Albans" of three properties in St. Albans, formerly of the Monastery, and "a watermill . . . in Chaddesley, Worc., which belonged to Bardesley Mon." September 1544.¹

These properties are also included in acquisition 2 and were sold in the next month but two after acquisition.

4. A licence "to William Breton, gentleman," to grant all his lands in Croxton, Cambridgeshire, which belonged to Huntingdon Priory, to "William Ratfurthe, yoman." May 24, 1549.²

These properties were a part of acquisition 3 and were kept about four years before being sold.

5. A licence "to Thomas Browne and William Breton of London, gentleman, to grant their Manor of Exall, Warw. . . . to Michael Comeswell of Newland, Warw., gent." March 30, 1553.³

This property was a part of acquisition 12, acquired on March 25, 1553, and sold only five days later.

6. A licence "to William Webbe and William Breton, of London, gentleman, to grant their manor of Wolfredowe, Heref., which belonged to the late Earl of March . . . to William Childe, gentleman." February 25, 1553.⁴

This is a property of acquisition 13, made February 24, 1553. The resale here occurred the day after the acquisition.

I have now summarized the thirteen documents of acquisition and the six documents of sale which the *Letters and Papers of Henry VIII* and the *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, yielded me. It will be remembered that Miss Teager discovered one document of acquisition and four documents of sale in the Ryerson Collection, the document of acquisition being evidently identical with my acquisition. Her four documents of sale, however, do not correspond with any of those which I have found. Altogether, therefore, we have twenty-three documents, thirteen of acquisition and ten of sale, which explain very clearly the fortune of William Breton. A man of such large affairs could well afford not only to leave his family well provided for, but to leave, as he did, a bequest for the education of a son of his elder brother and donations to charity, not only in his own parish but also in those communities in Essex to which family and friendly sentiment drew his affections, and

¹ *Ibid.*, xix (1544). ii. 196.

² *Calendar of Patent Rolls, Edward VI*, III (1549-51), p. 53.

³ *Ibid.*, v (1553), pp. 272-3.

⁴ *Ibid.*, v (1553), p. 275.

even to the poor townsmen and gownsmen of Cambridge. These documents also cast a sidelight upon the effect which the secularization of church property had upon the development of the middle class in England. Finally, they add to the evidence already existent in the will that Nicholas Breton grew up in a home of affluence, for the earliest acquisitions antedate by at least five years the birth of Nicholas.¹

Though William Breton evidently indulged in speculation, he also kept enough of the property he acquired to leave a good landed estate. At least nine of the bequests in the will can be identified with the acquisitions I have listed, and of course, it is probable that he made other acquisitions that have not yet been discovered. So much for the wealth of William Breton.

Let us now consider the poverty of Nicholas. As the second son, his inheritance was naturally limited, but it was sufficient. As we have seen, he was left two pieces of real property, the "Manor of Burgh in the Marsh" in Lincolnshire, which appears, according to acquisition 7, to have consisted of a messuage and forty-four acres, and "all those my landes and tenementes in Wykes in the Countie of Essex, called Nelmes, which I purchased of Henry Breton my brother." The "Rectory of Wykes" was obtained in acquisition 5, but the lands left to Nicholas were probably a part of the family heritage, bought by the rich brother in the city from a head of the family who had more land than cash.² From the terms of the bequest, this property would seem to have included more than one "tenement," and the term "all those my landes" would hardly have been used of an acre or two. To Nicholas was also bequeathed forty pounds in cash, a very tidy sum in those days, as well as half a dozen silver spoons, a silver-gilt salt cellar, and his father's own bed. As an additional safeguard, Nicholas was to be maintained out of the general funds of the estate until the age of

¹ Richard Breton, eldest son of William, was born November 25, 1550. Nicholas could not have been born before 1551. See Genevieve Ambrose, "George Gascoigne," *Review of English Studies*, II (1926), p. 167, and the *Inquisition Post Mortem* into the affairs of William Breton in *Abstracts of Inquisitiones Post Mortem for the City of London, during the Tudor Period*, Part II (1561-77), ed. S. J. Madge for the British Record Society, Ltd. (The Index Library) 1901, pp. 70-2.

² Morant, P., *The History and Antiquities of the County of Essex*, London, 1768, I. 379, says that "Wickes" is in Thurstable Hundred, adjoining Winstree Hundred, in which Laver Breton is situated. From his map, Wickes seems to be about eight miles from Laver Breton. "Nelmes" I have not been able to locate.

twenty-four, when his inheritance was to come to him unimpaired. Not a rich legacy this, but enough. With his lands and houses as a basis and an occasional pamphlet to keep the pot boiling, Nicholas Breton should not have been so acutely, almost morbidly, aware of the frostbite of poverty.

But the solicitous father had made one mistake. To his widow he left the administration of the estate until the children came of age, though with the express provision that, if she married again, she should forfeit all her rights. The sequel, in outline, is already pretty well known. The husband died January 12, 1559,¹ and there is evidence that, within three months, Elizabeth Breton was married, or betrothed to, or somehow involved with one Bowes or Boyes.² In September 1562, according to the diarist Machin, "Master Boyesse (Bowes) and Master Gaskyn (Gascoigne) and their men fought in "Redcrosse stret" and divers were wounded because "they both did marry one woman."³ In October 1562 Sir Nicholas Bacon issued an order, in his capacity of Lord Keeper, forbidding both George Gascoigne and Edward Bowes to visit Elizabeth Breton until it was decided whose wife she was.⁴

There can be little doubt that both the gallants ventured for the pelf. It is probable enough that Elizabeth was never actually married to Bowes, who doubtless claimed a marriage with her to serve his own ends,⁵ but there must have been a certain lack of discretion about a three-months' widow who could be manœuvred into such a position. Whatever may be the truth of the widow's relationship to Bowes, it would seem that Gascoigne had possession of her in November, 1562, when the marriage is recorded in the register of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and Miss Ambrose believes that the marriage actually took place earlier.⁶ At any rate, Gascoigne was established at Walthamstow, Essex, where the Bretons had property, in or before 1568.⁷

But what is more important, and what has heretofore been

¹ *Abstracts of Inquisitiones*, p. 72.

² Ward, B. M., "The Will of John Bacon," *Review of English Studies*, III (1927), pp. 446-8.

³ *The Diary of Henry Machin*, ed., J. G. Nichols (Camden Society), London, 1848, p. 293. Quoted by F. E. Schelling, *The Queen's Progress and other Elizabethan Sketches*, Boston and New York, 1904, p. 41.

⁴ Ward, *R.E.S.*, III (1927), pp. 447, 449.

⁵ Genevieve Ambrose, "George Gascoigne," *R.E.S.*, II (1926), p. 166.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 167.

⁷ Hazlitt, W. C., *The Complete Poems of George Gascoigne* (Roxburghe Library), London, 1869, I. xviii-xix.

overlooked, I find in the *Lincoln Episcopal Records* the following grant :

Grant by George Gascoigne, esq., and Elizabeth, his wife, late wife of William Breton of London, Gent., deceased, and executrix of his testament and will, the said George being guardian in right of the said Elizabeth of Richard Breton, son and heir of the said William, being under age, the said Richard being true patron, of the next advowson of the rectory of Southsomercootes, to Edward Leedes, Master of Clare Hall, Cambridge, and George Harrison, gent., and their executors and assigns [20 February, 1566].¹

The grant quoted above shows clearly that by 1566 the fleece had followed the lamb. Not only had Elizabeth Breton married again, but, in defiance of the will, she continued to administer the inheritance of her eldest son through her dashing new husband. Three years later, doubtless as a result of the *Inquisition* of October 27, 1567, already mentioned, and the *Mandamus* of October 12, 1568, mentioned by Grosart,² the usurpation was made legal by a patent from the Queen which gave to "G. Gascoigne" "*custodiam corporis et Maritagium predicti Rici Bretton*,"³ February 17, 1569. In the same patent is mentioned as one of the properties of Richard Breton "*Manior de Burghe, cum suis pertinentiis in comitatu nostre Lincoln*." It will be recalled that William Breton left his manor of Burgh in the County of Lincoln to his second son, Nicholas. It would seem, therefore, not only that the property of Nicholas came likewise under the control of Gascoigne, but that at least one of his manors was no longer in his name. And manors, like sheep, tend to follow the leader. Perhaps there was good reason for Nicholas Breton's complaints of poverty and denunciation of the baseness to which the love of money gave rise. Assuming that he was born in 1551 (he could not have been born earlier, and may have been born later), he was eight years old when his father died, not yet nine when his mother became involved with Bowes, eleven when Bowes and Gascoigne fought in the street before his mother's door for the spoils, fifteen when Gascoigne was illegally disposing of a living in the gift of his father's estate, sixteen and seventeen when legal proceedings as to the management of the estate were dragging their coils along, and eighteen when the Queen's patent confirmed the clearly illegal position of Gascoigne and listed Nicholas Breton's

¹ *Lincoln Episcopal Records*, 1571-84, ed. C. E. Foster (Lincoln Record Society No. 2), Lincoln, 1912, p. 244.

² *Grosart*, I. xx.

³ *Ward, R.E.S.*, II (1926), p. 37.

own property as belonging to the elder brother whose guardian Gascoigne became. Even if the evidence is not quite enough to convict Gascoigne of actual dishonesty (and the aroma of sharp practice will not down), a childhood spent in the contemplation of such a sordid struggle over the relics of his father was enough to give a tinge of cynicism to Nicholas Breton's comments upon the root of all evil. And it is almost too much to hope that the debonair but improvident Gascoigne, after stomaching the widow and her five children, defeating his rival, ignoring the will, having himself appointed Richard's guardian, and transferring the heritage of Nicholas to the name of Richard, should have left the birthright of Nicholas Breton entirely intact.

COLERIDGE, WIELAND'S *OBERON* AND THE WANDERINGS OF *CAIN*

BY WERNER W. BEYER

STARTING from the well-known fact that Coleridge once began a translation of Christoph Martin Wieland's *Oberon*, I endeavoured in a previous paper¹ to demonstrate that the English writer was familiar with the original (German) version of that poem, and that the translating activity, synchronous with the composition of *The Ancient Mariner*, seems to have contributed several threads to the bewitching ballad's multicoloured web. The burden of the present paper is to continue the demonstration of Coleridge's familiarity with Wieland's poetical romance through the abortive pattern of the earlier *Cain*, material for which, John Livingston Lowes long since proved, came of the same chaos that fed the loom which wove the all-but-synchronous later masterpieces.²

In my initial article it was suggested that Coleridge's interest in *Oberon* probably was first aroused by the provocative review and detailed analysis of the popular German romance, written by William Taylor of Norwich. This appreciation, perhaps one of the most significant of Taylor's eccentric lucubrations, appeared, it will be recalled, with the August (1797) issue of the *Monthly Review*.³ Coleridge's explicit statement concerning his *Oberon* translation was not made until November of the same year. At that time he wrote :

I am translating the Oberon of Wieland—it is a difficult Language, and I can translate at least as fast as I can construe.—I pray you, as soon as possible, procure for me a German-English Grammar—I believe there is but one—Widderburne's, I think—but I am not certain. I have written a

¹ *R.E.S.*, vol. xv, No. 60, Oct. 1939, pp. 401-11.

² J. L. Lowes, *The Road to Xanadu*, Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927, Cf. pp. 237, 454, and especially 538, note 54 ("The point of interest, however, is that in the phrase 'the same year' Coleridge first wrote 'the same month' [as the *Mariner*] . . . a slip which emphasizes the close concurrence in time [of the two poems] . . .").

³ *Monthly Review*, vol. xxiii (N.S.), pp. 576-84 (Appendix, 1797).

ballad of about 300 lines—and the Sketch of a Plan of General Study:—and I have made a very considerable proficiency in the French Language, and study it daily—and *daily study the German*—so that I am not, and have not been idle.¹

Moreover, evidence was also cited previously that some *eighteen months* before the above letter was composed, Coleridge was already busying himself with the German language and “in about *six weeks*” expected to “be able to read . . . [it] with tolerable fluency.” It may be added here that at least *sixteen months* elapsed between the date (May 6, 1796) of his first explicit admission of his having begun German and the appearance of Taylor’s *Oberon* review.² It need perhaps hardly be urged that in one and a half years he may well have acquired more than normal reading ability in the German tongue. Perhaps the present paper, further substantiating the evidence that I have already presented, will, incidentally, clarify yet more the problem of Coleridge’s early knowledge of German.

At any rate, the interval between the appearance of Taylor’s review and the momentous *Oberon* letter points to a logical inference. It would seem extremely dubious that Coleridge, with his multifarious interests and young family, should, shortly after the memorable walk to Watchet, actually have undertaken a translation of a lengthy German romance without having previously assured himself of its feasibility, let alone of the interest and appeal of the poem. If this inference be granted, it seems safe to venture the opinion that he must have read in *Oberon* some time *before* the November letter was written. Furthermore, his decision to translate Wieland’s

¹ MSS. of letter to Joseph Cottle, dated on cover “November 1797.” This letter is now in the Harvard College Library, and I am deeply indebted to Professor Lowes for a transcript of it and to Mr. Alfred C. Potter, librarian of the Harvard College Library, for permission to use the pertinent passage. (The italics are mine.)

The fragmentary letter, as Miss Keith Glenn, Research Assistant to Professor Lowes, pointed out to me, has never been either accurately or entirely published. It is misdated by A. Turnbull in his *Biographia Epistolaris* (London, G. Bell, 1911, vol. 1, p. 142). This editor apparently has copied the butchered text published by Jos. Cottle (*Reminiscences of . . . Coleridge and . . . Southey*, N.Y., Wiley and Putnam, 1847, pp. 106 and 120-1), and arbitrarily assigned the incorrect date, “2 Dec., 1797.” To another part of the letter Turnbull (*op. cit.*, 1. 141) has assigned the date “28 Nov., 1797”; but internal evidence—which cannot be rehearsed here—points to some time earlier in November as the correct date. In any event, Coleridge was translating *Oberon* about this time.

² Cf. Turnbull, 1. 78 [(letter of May 6, 1796, to Tom Poole) “I am studying German and in about six weeks . . .” etc.]; also *ibid.*, 1. 68, for evidence of the proposed Lessing translation (April 1, 1796).

masterpiece must have been actuated by good and sufficient reasons—very probably intense interest in more than one of its numerous arresting qualities.

We need not at present concern ourselves with the well-known history of the origins of *The Wanderings of Cain*—the abortive scheme of collaboration hatched, in the latter part of 1797, by Coleridge and Wordsworth; or, for that matter, with the part that the plan "to imitate the Death of Abel" may have played in the revealing fiasco.¹ Nor, fortunately, need we attempt to analyse once again the tangled skein of association with the then increasingly popular Ahasuerus theme, which Professor Lowes has demonstrated was interwoven with the unfinished fabric of *Cain*, as with *The Ancient Mariner*.² The present efforts will be directed elsewhere: to point out what seems to have been quite overlooked heretofore, that *Oberon*, which Coleridge was translating by November 1797, and into which he must have looked before that date, contains among its myriad compelling scenes two settings which are strikingly like the settings of *Cain*, a work whose date of composition we know was closely concurrent with that of Coleridge's preoccupation with *Oberon*.³ What is more, that Wieland's romance also contains several analogous characters and situations, a similar atmosphere, and even an echo of the Ahasuerus theme.

Now in his inimitable exposition of the genesis of one of the multitudinous threads of *The Ancient Mariner*, John Livingston Lowes has pointed out a further link of association between that poem and *Cain*:

... there was a further chance association which was bound to draw [Coleridge] in. The goal of the November pilgrimage [during which the *Mariner* was conceived] we know from Wordsworth was the famous Valley of Stones near Linton. And the Valley of Stones, with its *wild and fantastic chaos of rocks*—"the very bones and skeletons of the earth," as Southey calls them, shapeless as "a palace of the Preadamite kings, [or] a city of the Anakim"—this vale towards which the three [Coleridge and the Wordsworths] were walking, *had already furnished the setting for Coleridge's "Wanderings of Cain."*³

It is important, however, that we recall a significant phrase that occurs in a different context in the *Road to Xanadu*: "... there

¹ Cf. S. T. C.'s "Prefatory Note" to *Cain*, in *The Poems of Coleridge*, London, Oxford University Press, 1930, p. 341.

² *The Road to Xanadu*, pp. 246-7.

³ J. L. Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 259. (The italics are mine.) This opinion was perhaps based on Hazlitt's dictum (cf. *The Collected Works* . . . , ed. A. R. Waller and Arnold Glover, London, Dent, 1904, vol. xii, p. 273).

were tributary streams of recollection pouring in." ¹ Perhaps there were in this instance too. For Coleridge must have looked into *Oberon* at some time after Taylor's review appeared. And the explicit letter concerning the translation, the close chronologic concurrence, and evidence—already in part presented—that *Oberon* images were recalled elsewhere in Coleridge's poems, particularly in that *Ancient Mariner* which has been linked with *Cain* by Professor Lowes—all this, together with the attested "polarizing quality of [Coleridge's] reading . . . in which the mind moved like a magnet . . .," ² should lend more than a fortuitous interest to the numerous analogous image-clusters in *Oberon* and *Cain*. It is not insignificant, moreover, that the *Oberon* clusters are of incontrovertibly high visualizing power. But let us turn to Wieland.

In Canto VII, then, of *Oberon* (the same canto, it is noteworthy, from which in my initial paper I cited the double sun-image and the storm scene) ³ we now find Wieland's hero and heroine cast away upon the *desolate* shores of a wild, fantastically chaotic, *dæmon-haunted* volcanic island. Having been constrained by Charlemagne's decree to undertake a bizarre pilgrimage to Bagdad in *punishment for the slaying* (in self-defence) of the great emperor's disguised and degenerate son Charlot, Huon had won the protection of Oberon, King of Færy. And the magic horn, ring, and cup, presented him by the friendly *dæmon* prince, had enabled him to win the hand of Rezia (later baptized Amanda), the Caliph's daughter. Her transcendent beauty, however, had caused Huon to violate Oberon's injunction of chastity. When the passionately devoted pair had disobeyed him, Oberon's *persecution* had involved them in the fearful storm, the drawing of sacrificial lots, and Huon's public condemnation. Her lover having been compelled to leap into the storm-lashed sea, Rezia had leaped with him. And now, naked, cold, and wretched, they were involved in the first of a long and harrowing series of trials and tribulations.

This brief analysis will already have suggested several analogies with *Cain*. But let us turn to Coleridge's second setting:

The scene around was desolate; as far as the eye could reach it was desolate: the bare rocks faced each other, and left a long and wide interval of thin

¹ J. L. Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

² *Ibid.*, p. 34.

³ The *Ancient Mariner* sun-image occurs in *Oberon*, VII. 93; and the storm scene in VII. 18. Between these clusters the greater part of the present evidence was found.

white sand. You might wander on and *look round and round*, and peep into the *crevices* of the *rocks* and discover *nothing* that *acknowledged* the influence of the *seasons*. There was no spring, no summer, no autumn: and the winter's snow, that would have been lovely, fell not on these *hot rocks* and *scorching sands*.¹

In the seventh canto of *Oberon* there is this desolate setting:

Die ganze Insel scheint vulkanischer Ruin,
Und nirgends ruht das Aug' auf Laub und frischem Grün. (Oberon, VII. 37.)

Der Sand brennt ihren Fuss, die schroffen Steine glühen,
Und ach! kein Baum, kein Busch, der ihr ein Obdach flicht! (Oberon, VII. 39.)

Mit unermüdetem Fuss besteigt der junge Mann
Die Klippen rings umher, und schaut so weit er kann: [as far . . .]
Ein schreckliches Gemisch von Felsen und von Klüften [rocks . . . crevices]
Begegnet seinem Blick, wohin er thränend blinkt.
Da lockt kein saftig Grün aus blumenvollen Triften . . . (Oberon, VII. 44.)²

These parallel settings must give us pause. If we translate the *Oberon* lines (even as Coleridge did?) we find that Wieland's "*whole island seems volcanic ruin, and nowhere does the eye rest on foliage or fresh green*"; "*The sand burns her foot, the rugged stones glow*" and there is "*no tree, no bush*." Later Huon "*climbs the rocks roundabout and peers as far as he can*: a frightful mixture of *rocks* and *crevices* meets his eye *wherever he looks*. There *no succulent green beckons . . .*" In Wieland's lonely and desolate island of stones, in short, "*nothing acknowledges . . . the seasons*" either. And even as in *Cain* there is a vivid intimation of space and of a relentless tropical sun, beneath which there are sand and cliffs and crevices all oddly juxtaposed in a kindred setting where the *sand* and the *stones*

¹ *The Poems of Coleridge*, pp. 344-5. (The italics, of course, are mine throughout.)

² *Oberon* was first published in *Der Teutsche Merkur vom Jahre 1780*, Erstes Vierteljahr, Weimar. The text was somewhat revised in later editions, chiefly that of 1785 in *Wielands auserlesene Gedichte*, Leipzig, bey Weidmanns Erben und Reich, Dritter und Vierter Band. The original fourteen-canto text was redivided into twelve cantos, and numerous minor changes improved the poem, making this edition the chief transmitter of the canon. Further, chiefly typographic, revisions were made in the 1791 edition. Coleridge probably translated from the 1796 edition which Taylor reviewed (*C. M. Wielands Sämmtliche Werke*, Leipzig, G. J. Göschen, 1796, Bde. XXII and XXIII). But in this, as in the edition below which I have used, there are few significant changes from the original version of 1780, save those of numerical rearrangement of stanzas, punctuation, and orthography. For the textual collation, see the definitive edition: *Wielands Gesammelte Schriften*, Herausgegeben von der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, Weidmann, 1935, Erste Abteilung: Werke, Dreizehnter Band, pp. 8A, ff. (Appendix). All my references are to this collated edition.

are similarly *scorching*. The most casual collation of the two passages must reveal the numerous analogous features.

Now let us glance at another aspect of this setting. Omitting but a single sentence in *The Wanderings of Cain*, there is this :

The *pointed* and *shattered summits of the ridges of the rocks* made a rude mimicry of human concerns, and seemed to prophesy mutely of things that then were not ; steeples, and battlements, and ships with naked masts.¹

And in the same canto of *Oberon* as the previous cluster (this time only *three stanzas beyond* the double *sun-image*) the following potent pictures appear—doubly magnetic in the light of the famous Valley of Stones :

Dasteht er nun am Fuss der *aufgebirgten Zacken* !
Sie liegen vor ihm da wie *Trümmern* einer Welt :
Ein Chaos ausgebrannter Schlacken,
In die ein Feuerberg zuletzt zusammen fällt,
Mit *Felsen* untermischt, die, *tausendfach gebrochen*
In wilder ungeheurer Pracht, . . .

(*Oberon*, VII. 97.)

Here, then, in *Oberon* we find "heaped-up *jagged pinnacles* (or *pointed summits*)"; "wreckage of a world"; "a chaos of extinct slags into which a volcano finally collapses, mixed with huge *rocks*" which lie "*shattered* a thousandfold in wild, prodigious splendour." Wieland's island setting seems to resemble closely not only that in *The Wanderings of Cain* but also Southey's imaginative description of the Valley of Stones near Linton.² Passing over the curious fact that Southey, in his *Thalaba*, borrowed generously from stanzas of *Oberon* that are immediately adjacent to the setting just discussed,³ the vivid analogies between Wieland's scene and the setting of *Cain* surely permit the inference that the "sleeping images" must have been stirred profoundly in Coleridge's mind by this timely literary recollection.⁴ Let us emphasize again the strangely similar moods of despair that seem to hover over the vast awful desolation—of the

¹ *The Poems of Coleridge*, pp. 344-5. (The italics, of course, are mine throughout.)

² Cf. p. 276 above, and J. L. Lowes, *op. cit.*, pp. 259 and 549, note 89.

³ See Theodor Zeiger, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Einflusses der neueren deutschen Literatur auf die Englische*, Berlin, Duncker, 1901, pp. 53-6. Southey used *Oberon*, VIII. 1 and 4, etc., the first of which is but *three stanzas beyond* the present scene!

⁴ It must be borne in mind that *The Wanderings of Cain* is a brief, compact fragment of half a dozen pages. This circumstance, it seems to me, lends a peculiar and even greater significance to the similarly compact sequence of parallels—of intrinsically unrelated features—in *Oberon*.

towering jagged summits (logically suggesting steeples, masts, or battlements); of the shattered, crenellated rocks (interspersed with crevices); and of the identical burning sands and rugged rocks. There can be no doubt at least that the last feature hardly derived from Bristol Channel! If we again recall Coleridge's *Oberon* translation, the close concurrence in time, his "falcon's eye" and long preoccupation with the elements and every expression on the face of earth, sea, and sky;¹ if we are reminded, too, of his "memory tenacious and systematizing";² then these pregnant clusters of intensely visualized *images*—which occur amidst strikingly similar contexts—must assume more than passing interest. For surely they offer a plethora of potential *atomes crochus*.

Yet they are not all. Let us examine the psychological analogies, which parallel the atmosphere of the two passages:

"... and I groaned [says Enos to Cain] ... even as thou groanest when thou givest me to eat, and when thou coverest me at evening, and as often as I stand at thy *knee* and thine eyes look at me?" Then Cain stopped, and stifling his groans he *sank to the earth*, and the child Enos stood in the darkness beside him."³

In *Oberon*, but five stanzas beyond the description of the desolate island, these incisive images appear:

Amanden, die drey tödtlich lange Stunden
An diesem öden Strand, wo alles Furcht erweckt, [desolate]
Wo jeder Laut bedroht und selbst die Stille schreckt . . .

Matt, wie sie war, erschöpfte diese Müh
Noch ihre letzte Kraft; es brachen ihr die *Knie*;
Sie sinkt am Ufer hin, und lechzt mit dürrem Gaumen.
Vom Hunger angenagt, von heissem Durst *gequält*,
An diesem wilden Ort, . . .

(*Oberon*, VII. 49-50.)

Here, again, in juxtaposition with the first cluster, exactly as in *The Wanderings of Cain*, there is a "desolate strand where everything, even the silence, awakens fear"; and here too is an exhausted wanderer who also *sinks to earth*, and who is tortured by hunger and thirst.⁴ This scene is almost analogous in time as well as in place. Moreover, the pervasive atmosphere of weariness, desperation,

¹ J. L. Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

² *Ibid.*, p. 43.

³ *The Poems of Coleridge*, p. 343.

⁴ This cluster has already revealed numerous linking atoms; but in the very next stanza Amanda looks on all sides until in the last light of the setting sun she discovers Huon, who soon stands beside her ("... schaut nach allen Seiten./Und mit dem letzten Sonnenblick/Entdeckt sie ihn . . . er kommt zurück!").

fear, and persecution is suggestively close to the dominant mood of *Cain*. For that piece immediately continues thus :

And Cain lifted up his voice and *cried* bitterly and said, "The *Mighty One* that *persecuteth* me is on this side and that ; he *pursueth* my soul like the *wind* . . . he is around me *even as the air* !" ¹

Now, in the stanzas immediately adjacent in *Oberon*, Huon, it will be recalled, is also persecuted by a *Mighty One* who is everywhere—a *spirit of the air*, who *pursued* him with *wind* and storm (cf. VII. 28-38). And now Huon, desperate and in fearful anguish for Rezia, lifts up his voice too :

So soll ich, *ruft er aus*, und beisst vor wilder *Pein* [agony]
Sich in die Lippen, ach ! so soll ich denn mit leeren
Trostlosen Händen wiederkehren, . . .

Eh' dich des *Himmels Zorn* in meine Arme stiess,
Dir bleibt (hier fing er an vor Wuth und Angst zu brüllen)
Bleibt nicht so viel—den Hunger nur zu stillen !

Laut schrie er auf in unnennbarem Schmerz ;
Dann *sank er hin*, und lag in fürchterlicher Stille . . .

(*Oberon*, VII. 45-7.)

Adjacent passages in *Cain* here correspond to contiguous passages in *Oberon*, and again there is a strange analogy in action and mood. The persecuted Huon, *who is also a wanderer*, mentions the *wrath of heaven* and vividly conveys his desperation, bitterness, fear and hunger, before he too *cries out* and *sinks to earth*.² Yet we have not nearly exhausted the *Cain* cluster.

The very next sentence in Coleridge's passage reads thus :
. . . even as the air ! O that I might be utterly no more ! *I desire to die*—yea . . .¹

In *Oberon* again, and in almost the same sequence, Rezia is utterly crushed when Huon's search for food proves delusive :

Amanda, sanft und still, doch mit gebrochnem Muth,
Die Augen ausgelöscht, die Wangen welk, zu Scherben
Die Lippen ausgedörrt—Lass, spricht sie, *lass mich sterben* !

Auch Sterben ist an deinem Herzen süß ;
Und Dank dem *Rächer*, der in seinem *Grimme*,
So streng er ist, doch diesen Trost mir liess ! . . .

(*Oberon*, VII. 55-6.)

¹ *The Poems of Coleridge*, p. 343.

² In passing, it is interesting to note that Coleridge had another reason for noting the last stanza with peculiar intentness. For there ("Schon *schmilzt* im *Ozean* Der *Sonnenrand* zu Gold . . .") there not only occurs another linking image of evening, but also it is one which is typical of Wieland's unusually poetic interest in the elements.

While Cain speaks of persecution and of his "*desire to die*", Rezia cries "*Let me die*" before she mentions the Avenger. A number of fainter echoes in this cluster we must, in the interest of completeness, mention in a note.¹ Thus powerfully, in a poem we know Coleridge was translating at a time nearly synchronous with the writing of *The Wanderings of Cain*, we have so far seen not only a strikingly similar desolate setting of shattered rocks and scorching sand, but also an unmistakably analogous atmosphere of the agonized suffering of kindred wanderers who also sink to earth and yearn for death, who cry out desperately to persecuting higher powers that seem to abide in the air and pursue with wind. And the parallel settings, situations, and moods, with their clusters of sensuous and highly visualized *images*, occur, curiously enough, in similarly contiguous, virtually parallel sequences. Yet this is still not all.

In *Oberon* there is another compelling image-cluster; it occurs at the end of Canto VII (in which we have thus far found all the *Cain* parallels) and at the beginning of Canto VIII. This fact seems unusually significant. For the passage extends from the setting in the shattered rocks, the "chaos of extinct slags" which we have already seen,² to Huon's meeting with the hermit, a cluster I previously cited in connection with *The Ancient Mariner*.³

¹ Again, in the very next stanzas, Huon cries out to God for a drop of water; assumes all the blame ("Ich, ich allein bin schuldig!"); and pleads that the Avenger's *wrath* fall upon him alone. Then he exclaims: "... mir werde die Natur/Ringsum zum Grab, zum offenen Höllenrachen" ("let Nature round about be my grave, an open throat of hell"). He resumes the search for food and swears rather "to bury himself in these rocks, consumed by thirst and hunger," than to return empty-handed to the cave ("... von Durst und Hunger aufgezehrt, In diesen Felsen zu begraben, / Eh' er ... zur Höhle wiederkehrt. / Er, ruft er weinend ...") [*Oberon*, VII. 57-8].

Cain in his agony cries: "O that I might be utterly no more! I desire to die ... O that a man might live without the breath of his nostrils. So I might abide in darkness, and blackness, and an empty space!"

Perhaps the unmistakable analogies of setting, characters, and atmosphere—here as in the more palpable cluster above—may warrant the question, Is "*darkness and blackness and an empty space*" an echo of Huon's cave or open throat of hell?

But at any rate, Cain and Rezia and Huon all "*desire to die*." And the *Oberon* clusters abound in a multitude of powerful linking images—of hunger and thirst, guilt, divine wrath and vengeance, agonized cries. What is more, in identically parallel sequence, Cain remarks: "... the torrent that roareth far off hath a voice"; while Huon also remarks the sound of water—in the same context ("Kaum sprach er's aus, so kommt's ihm vor/Als hör' er wie das Rieseln einer Quelle/Nicht fern von ihm. . . .": [*Oberon*, VII. 59]. Save for farness, Huon's "murmur of a spring" and Cain's roaring torrent seem suggestively akin, especially since they occur in identical sequence in the same context.

² Cf. p. 279 above (*Oberon*, VII. 97).

³ R.E.S., xv. 60., p. 408.

Dr. Lowes, it will be recalled, long since linked that poem with the stuff of *Cain*.¹ Let us first turn to the opening paragraphs of the latter piece:

... Their road was through a *forest of fir-trees* . . . and the *path* was broad, and the moonlight, and the moonlight shadows reposed upon it. . . . But soon the path winded and became *narrow*; the sun at high noon sometimes speckled it, but never illumined it, and now it was *dark* as a cavern.

"It is dark, O my father!" said Enos, "but the *path* under our feet is *smooth* and soft, and we shall soon come out into the *open* moonlight."²

As Enos says, Cain's path through the *forest*, at first broad and *lighted* and soon *narrow* and *dark*, is or becomes *smooth* and soon emerges into a *clearing*. Now at the very outset of the most prolific and largest *Overon* cluster, Huon, desperately attempting to scale the dizzy cliffs, finds that the *narrowest path*, with the *light* on it, is now and then blocked by huge boulders (which evidently form *dark* patches or possibly caverns). And then in the same sequence, Huon's path becomes *even*.³ Whether or not there was a fir-forest with dark, winding paths leading to a clearing near the Valley of Stones one would like to know. For now there is exactly that in *Overon*—in *identical* juxtaposition, let us note, with the desolate landscape of shattered rocks and scorching sands—even as in *The Wanderings of Cain*.⁴ Evidently Huon's agonized cries have been heard. The path having become even, the next stanza brings us to the teeming eighth canto:

Erstiegen war nunmehr der erste von den *Gipfeln*, [summits]
Und vor ihm liegt, gleich einem Felsensahl,
Hoch *überwölbt* von alten *Tannengewipfeln*,
In stiller *Dämmerung* ein kleines schmales Thal. [twilight]

¹ J. L. Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 454, n. 23.

² *The Poems of Coleridge*, pp. 342-3.

³ Cf. *Overon*, VII. 98 ("Bald auf dem schmalsten Pfad verrammeln Felsenstücke/Im Weg und Licht . . .") and VII. 99 ("Allmählich *ebnet sich* der Pfad . . .").

⁴ Cf. *Cain* in *The Poems* . . . , p. 344 ("Behold the bare rocks are a few of thy strides distant from the forest . . .") *Cain*'s second setting is in a hot region "where *nothing* acknowledged the influence of the seasons" as far "as the eye could reach". Thus the fir-forest must be *beyond the ridges* of the rocks. The juxtaposition of forest and desolate setting in the rocks is even more odd because of an *identical juxtaposition and correlation of such discordant settings in Overon*.

Hazlitt's description of the Valley of Stones region, significantly, mentions only this: "We walked for miles and miles on dark brown heaths overlooking the Channel . . . at times descended into little sheltered valleys . . . and then had to ascend conical little hills with a path winding up through a coppice to the barren top. . . ." (Cf. p. 276, note 3, above).

There is the *clearing* and a suggestion of half-light and the *fir-forest* ("Tannenwipfeln") *forming an arch* over the little narrow vale. But let us end the stanza :

Ein Schauder überfällt den matten
Erschöpften *Wanderer*, indem sein wankender Schritt
Duess düstre Heiligthum der Einsamkeit betritt ;
Ihm ist, er tret'ins stille *Reich der Schatten*.

(*Oberon*, VIII. 1.)

The images here are so compelling that they must be translated : "A shudder passes over the *faint*, exhausted *wanderer* as his swerving stride bears him into this dark sanctuary of solitude. It seems to him as if he were entering the silent *Realm of Shades*." If ever images were magnetic or romantic or capable of evoking others in kind, these surely are ¹

Now Cain is also "faint" and "exhausted" from *his wanderings* far and wide and on the forest path :

. . . and Cain being *faint* and *feeble* rose slowly on his knees and pressed himself against the trunk of a *fir*, and stood upright and followed the child.²

Till now, however, several features of Cain's path have not yet appeared in *Oberon* :

The *path* was dark till within three *strides' length of its termination*, when it *turned* suddenly ; the thick black *trees formed* a low *arch* and the moon-light appeared for a moment like a *dazzling portal*. Enos ran before him and *stood in the open air* . . .

In *Oberon* we have seen light and dark sections of the path and also the *fir-trees* which *formed an arch* over the valley clearing. In the next stanza Huon's path continues through the rocks and momentarily seems to disappear :

¹ Coleridge of the *Geisterseher* and the multitudinous exclamation points and the breathless pursuit of even the most exotic daemon lore ! And here in both poems we are almost upon the hermit and the *Shape*.

² (*The Poems* . . . , p. 344.) With reference to Coleridge's description of Cain with his "*wasted*" limbs and glaring eye and his "countenance that told in a strange and terrible language" of his *agonies*, it is not insignificant that when Huon "*weak from hunger and numb with weariness*" (VIII. 5) *emerged* from the dark path into the clearing—to be exact, from a *winding path* near bare rocks into the half-light of the "little narrow vale" over which "*old fir-tree tops arch*" (VIII. 1.)—Huon comes suddenly upon the hermit. And the holy man, who soon after is hailed Huon's *father*, is *frightened* because he believes Huon a *tortured ghost* ("gequälter Geist"). And the hermit also conveys vividly his impression that that wanderer's *eye* and *mien* ("dein Blick und Ansehn") also tell of fearful *agony* ("Pein"). To this stanza (VIII. 6) we shall return somewhat later.

Bis durchs Gesträuch, das aus den Spalten nickt,
Sich eine Öffnung zeigt, die (wie er bald befindet) [opening]
Der Anfang ist von einem schmalen Gang
Der durch den Felsen sich um eine Spindel windet,
Fast senkrecht, mehr als hundert Stufen lang.

Kaum hat er athemlos den letzten Tritt erstiegen,
So stellt ein Paradies sich seinen Augen dar;
Und vor ihm steht ein Mann von edeln, ernsten Zügen, . . .

(Oberon, VIII. 3-4.)

Here, showing through the shrubbery in the crevices ("Spalten"), there is an opening (*portal*?) which proves to be the beginning of a narrow passage which *winds* ("turns suddenly"?) almost vertically more than a hundred *steps' length*. And at the end of this, Huon's second "dazzling portal" proves to be a *paradise* and he stands in the *open*. There can be small question of the vividness of Wieland's electrifying cluster. The details are intensely visualized, as indeed the other clusters were, and they provide a veritable host of links for the "prehensile filaments of association." It must not be overlooked that these images occur in a context already analysed in connection with *The Ancient Mariner*—who was also a wanderer who met a hermit. Many of the features of the path Coleridge's present wanderer bestrode appear in the path taken by Wieland's wanderer. Now the ends of both paths bring us in *identically similar sequence* to an analogous ghostly meeting.

Let us proceed. In the *Oberon* cluster last cited we saw the narrow *passage winding through the rock* ("Felsen"); and that at its termination Huon stepped forth into a paradise where "a man of noble and earnest features confronted him. Now at the end of the winding path in *Cain*, "as far from the [analogous] wood as a boy might sling a pebble of the brook, there was *one rock* by itself at a small distance from the main ridge." (It is important to recall that Huon had just ascended the first of the *summits*.¹) Only three sentences farther, this occurs:

But ere they had reached the *rock* they beheld a human shape: his back was towards them, and they were advancing unperceived, when they heard him smite his breast and cry aloud, "Woe is me! woe is me! I must never die again [Rezia?], and yet I am perishing with *thirst* and *hunger*."²

We have long since heard Huon cry aloud and swear "rather to bury himself, consumed by *thirst and hunger*, amidst these crags."³ Now

¹ Cf. p. 283 above.

² *The Poems* . . . , p. 345.

³ Cf. p. 282 note 1 above and *Oberon*, VII. 57-8. The nature of the exposition of such material as this—and the fact may throw some light on the nature of the

after the kindred visions, *The Wanderings of Cain* immediately continues :

Pallid . . . became the face of Cain ; but the child Enos took hold of . . . his father's robe, and *raised his eyes to his father*, and listening whispered, " Ere yet I could speak, I am sure, O my father, that I heard that voice ? " . . . and Cain *trembled* exceedingly. The voice was sweet indeed, but it was thin and querulous like that of a feeble slave in misery, who *despairs* altogether, yet can not refrain himself from *weeping* and *lamentation* [Huon]. And behold ! Enos glided forward, and *creeping softly round the base of the rock, stood before the stranger, and looked up into his face* [Huon]. And the Shape shrieked, and turned round, and Cain beheld him, that his limbs and face were those of his brother Abel whom he had killed ! . . .

Thus as he stood in silence and darkness of soul, the Shape *fell at his feet, and embraced his knees* and cried out with a bitter outcry . . .¹

And several times thereafter the Shape falls to the earth, even as Rezia and Huon had on the desolate strand, and as Huon—who has just entered " a realm of shades "—now falls before the hermit. The *Oberon* stanzas immediately contiguous with those last cited indeed contain God's plenty :

Doch Hüon—*schwach* vor Hunger, und erstarrt [weak with hunger]
Vor Müdigkeit, und nun, in diesen wilden Höhen,
Wo er so lang' umsonst auf Menschenanblick harrt, [glimpse of a human]
Und vor der Felsen Stirn, die ringsum vor ihm stehen, [rocks]
Uralte Tannen nur auf ihn herunter wehen,
Auf einmal überrascht von einem weissen Bart—[surprised]
Glaubt wirklich ein Gesicht zu sehen, [face]
Und sinkt zur Erde hin vor seiner Gegenwart [sinks to earth].

Der Eremit, kaum weniger betroffen
Als Hüon selbst, *bebt* einen Schritt zurück ; [tremble]
Doch spricht er, schnell gefasst : Hast du, wie mich dein Blick
Und Ansehn glauben heisst, Erlösung noch zu hoffen
Aus deiner Pein, so sprich, was kann ich für dich thun, [agony]
Gequälter Geist ? wie kann ich für dich büssen, [tortured ghost]
Um jenen Port dir aufzuschliessen
Wo, unberührt von Qual, die Frommen ewig ruhn ?

So bleich und abgezehrt, mit Noth und Gram umfungen [pallid]
Als Hüon schien, war der Verstoß, in den
Der alte Vater fiel, nur allzu leicht begangen.
Allein, wie beide sich recht in die Augen sehn, [look into each other's eyes]
Und als der Greis aus Hüons Mund vernommen
Was ihn hierher gebracht, wiewohl sein Anblick schon
Ihm alles sagt, *umarmt* er ihn wie einen Sohn, [embrace . . . son]
Und heisst recht herzlich ihn in seiner Klaus' willkommen ; . . .

(*Oberon*, VIII. 5-7.)

creative process in Coleridge's mind—tends to blur the fact that *all* the images I have attempted to trace in *Cain* occur within a few pages (three in my edition), even as in *Oberon* (where they occur within about twelve).

¹ *The Poems* . . ., p. 343.

Since the myriad elements reproduced are, *per se*, no wise necessarily related, was this teeming cluster of searing images, with its electrifying composite of kindred atmosphere, setting, characters, situation, phraseology and melody, drawn into the plan to "imitate the Death of Abel"? It were well to examine carefully the richly multifarious pictures in this largest cluster. Let us collate them: The "tortured spirit," Huon, is "faint from hunger," even as a few pages earlier he was *weak from thirst* (like the *Shape*). He has long waited vainly for the "*glimpse of a human being*." And suddenly "in these wild heights" and near "the brow of the rocks which stand round about him, where ancient *fir-trees waft down upon him alone*" ("The *fir branches drip down upon thee*, my son," says Cain¹); there Huon is "surprised by a white beard—actually believes he sees a face, and sinks to earth" before the holy man's presence. And the hermit equally taken aback, *trembles* and thinks Huon a *ghost* or a *tortured spirit* ("Gequälter Geist") because (like Cain) he is so *pallid* ("bleich") and emaciated ("abgezehrt"). But the holy man believes from *his look* and aspect that Huon is not beyond hope of salvation. And when Huon (like Enos) *raises his eyes* to the old *father*, since "his mien already told him all" (like the face of Cain?) the hermit *embraces him* as a son.² So many features occur in a synchronous *poetical embodiment*!

Why did Coleridge write to Cottle, "*I am translating the Oberon of Wieland*" at a time shortly after the historic walk to Watchet—the walk which saw the conception of *The Ancient Mariner*? Why did Coleridge venture the opinion that

The Germans were not a poetical nation in the very highest sense. *Wieland was their best poet*—his subject was bad, and his thought often impure, but *his language was rich and harmonious and his fancy luxuriant*. Sotheby's translation had not at all caught the manner of the original.³

How did Coleridge *know* that "Sotheby's translation had *not at all* caught the manner of the original"? Perhaps the evidence I have been presenting will have suggested the answer. For the myriad

¹ *The Poems, loc. cit.*

² Finally, at the end of the cluster (stanza 8), there is a "*fresh spring*" which, "quite near his roof, bubbles out of a rock." In *Cain* we saw that "... as far from the wood as a boy might sling a pebble of the brook, there was one rock by itself at a small distance from the main ridge."

³ Cf. the recollections of May 1811, recorded by Justice Coleridge (H. N. Coleridge, ed., *Specimens of the Table-Talk of the late Samuel Taylor Coleridge*, London, J. Murray, 1835, vol. 1, p. 345).

images we have seen unmistakably attest the fairness of Coleridge's opinion that Wieland's language *was* rich and harmonious, that his fancy (or imagination ?) *was* luxuriant. Certainly more than one of the clusters we have been examining reveals luxuriant imagery, haunting melody and vivid phraseology, let alone the subtle power of suggestion, of providing hooks and eyes for the mysterious "prehensile filaments of association."

Again, can the host of parallels—of *elements no wise necessarily related*—of settings and atmosphere and phraseology, characters and incidents, the persecution theme, the desolation and agonized suffering and the ghostly meeting—can the vast gallimaufry of *specific* analogies—the landscape of shattered rocks and scorching sand; the fir-forest later, winding paths, ridges, clearings; the confrontation (in almost identically parallel sequence!) with exhausted, emaciated, feeble, pallid *wanderers* who have similarly suffered hunger and thirst and terrible agony of soul, who sink to earth and cry out because they are persecuted by a higher power—*can* all this be sheer coincidence?

We know that Coleridge was *translating Oberon* at a time nearly synchronous with the writing of the *The Wanderings of Cain*, as with the writing of *The Ancient Mariner*. And we know, too, thanks especially to Professor Lowes, that "there were tributary streams of recollection pouring in"; and that "at moments of high imaginative tension associations not merely in pairs but in battalions are apt . . . to stream together and coalesce."¹ We have seen battalions of images, and we have seen in how strange a farrago they appear. Perhaps one of the most illuminating of Professor Lowes's conclusions as to the ways of the imagination is this:

For the more multifarious, even the more incongruous and chaotic the welter, the freer play it offers to those darting, prehensile filaments of association which reach out in all directions through the mass.²

* * *

The fact that the evidence I have just presented has not heretofore been discovered is doubtless due to the circumstance that Wieland has been neglected till now, and also to the truth of Coleridge's dictum that Sotheby's translation did not at all catch "the manner of the original."³ In concluding the present phase, it

¹ J. L. Lowes, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³ Cf. *Oberon*, a Poem from the German of Wieland, by William Sotheby, Esq. (2 vols.), London, Cadell and Davies, 1798.

can only be hoped that the *Cain* evidence, part from its own possible interest, will have drawn the formative conceptions of *The Wanderings of Cain* and *The Ancient Mariner* a little closer together; and that it will have thrown some revealing light upon the nature of Coleridge's early knowledge of German—to which topic I shall elsewhere return.

THE USE OF ANTICIPATION IN *BEOWULF*

BY ADRIEN BONJOUR

THERE is perhaps no other epic poem in Germanic literature in which anticipation has been so constantly used as in *Beowulf*. It is so characteristic a feature in the narrative element of the poem that it has been noted, of course, by almost every *Beowulf* editor and commentator. To quote one of our living authorities on *Beowulf*: "It is not a little remarkable that in the account of the three great fights of the hero, care has been taken to state the outcome of the struggle in advance."¹

But although carefully and frequently noticed, this trait has called for rather a modest amount of comment in comparison, say, with the use of repetition. It has hardly been considered as raising a real problem, whereas repetition, leading to apparent inconsistencies, has sometimes been eagerly fought over, the more so in that it provided arguments for pro- and anti-patchwork theorists. Indeed, the prevalent attitude towards anticipation is simply to regard it as an interesting device, remarkable for the fondness with which the *Beowulf* poet handles it, but common among heroic poems. The tendency, in fact, to dismiss the use of anticipation in *Beowulf* as a common device in epic poems of Germanic literature may be illustrated in one of the most recent and authoritative surveys of *Beowulf*. "Eine Technik der Vordeutung," writes Hermann Schneider, "ist uns aus anderen Heldenepen germanischer Zunge geläufig; weniger Gemeingut, eigentümlicherer Besitz des Beowulf-dichters scheint zu sein das ständige Verfahren der Nachholung."² Then follows one and a half pages on the problem of the so-called inconsistencies or contradictions raised by repetition.³ It would be foolish, of course, to challenge the truth of Schneider's statement,

¹ F. Klaeber ed., *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, New York, 1928, p. lviii.

² H. Schneider, *Germanische Heldensage*, Leipzig, 1934, Bd. II, Abt. 2, pp. 11-12.

³ It is interesting to see, however, that, when reviewing in a later paragraph the use of repetition, Schneider includes a few remarks on the technique of anticipation, mainly showing that it is more varied than in the *Nibelungenlied* and leads to formal prophecy, whereas on other occasions it is more sketchy. As he considers

which is no less than an established fact, and the opinion that anticipation belongs more to the *Gemeingut* of Germanic heroic poetry and seems less peculiar to the *Beowulf* poet than his use of repetition may be endorsed without restriction. Nevertheless, is there not another kind of approach, allowing us to form an estimate of the use of anticipations from a different angle, in closer relation to the poem itself? Is it enough to think, what is quite true, that "evidently disregard of the element of suspense was not considered a defect in story telling,"¹ and leave it at that, or should we think that the poet made such a lavish use of anticipation because it is very common in Germanic poetry? Or should we not perhaps inquire whether it has an actual relevance to the individual *Beowulf* poem as a work of art? In other words, is it possible to account for that remarkable use of anticipation in the poem strictly on artistic grounds, independent of a common tradition? To examine the question is our purpose in this paper.

For the sake of clearness we may consider that there are two main groups of anticipations, if we classify them according to the kind of events predicted. In the first group we have anticipations of events which we actually see happening later on in the poem, in accordance with the prediction. The second group consists of "allusive" anticipations (if we may call them so), *i.e.* anticipations of events which are supposed to happen in a near or distant future, but are never set forth in the course of the poem; they may refer, of course, to facts probably well known to the reader (or the audience) of *Beowulf*, but, in contrast with those of the first group, there is no single confirmation of them anywhere in the poem, apart from further allusions. This evidently involves a slight difference in the artistic value of the two kinds of anticipation which, we shall see, justifies the division adopted here.

Before attempting an interpretation of their artistic value, it is necessary to give a brief summary of the first group of anticipations. As we know, the outcome of the three great fights of *Beowulf* is carefully told in advance. In the case of the Grendel fight it is made clear at least four times with various degrees of directness:

the use of repetition as one of the five means the application of which "gibt dem Werke das Gepräge voller Einheitlichkeit", and seems to include therein the technique of anticipation, this leads, of course, indirectly to the position adopted here, the attempt to ascertain the value of anticipations from the artistic point of view. Cf. below and Schneider, *op. cit.* pp. 15-16.

¹ Klaeber, *ibid.*

three times before the actual struggle takes place (696-702, 706-7,¹ 743-6), and once towards the end of the fight, just before the decisive phase (805-8). Although the fight with Grendel's mother is much harder for the hero, "swyð, lāþ ond longsum," we are told of Beowulf's final victory once only—and not much in advance, but in the heat of the fight (1,553-6).² With the dragon's fight, however, the issue is predicted again quite clearly three times before the outset (2,310-11, 2,341-4,³ 2,420-4) and twice in the course of the struggle (2,573-5, 2,586-91). Furthermore, there are at least two passages which seem to give us a hint of the outcome (2,397-400, 2,410-11, 17).⁴ But this is not all, for the poet also uses anticipations in matters of secondary importance: the woe which befalls the warriors (or "beer-drinkers")⁵ in the hall, and, more specifically, Aeschere, on the coming of Grendel's mother, is gradually announced in a threefold allusion.⁶ The poet even uses anticipation in a purely incidental narrative. On the introduction of the Finn episode we are told that the scop had to recite about "Finnes eafterum, ða hie se fæar begeat" (1,068), which is rightly considered by Klaeber as

¹ If we interpret "under sceadu bregdan" as is usually done, "draw them down to the shades," i.e. kill them (so Klaeber, *op. cit.* p. 150; cf. too J. Hoops, *Kommentar zum Beowulf*, Heidelberg, 1932, p. 90), we have a clear case of anticipation. But even if the alternative, although less probable, meaning "snatch them off in the darkness" (without their being aware of it, as he did with all his other victims, when they were asleep) should be adopted, the implication seems hardly less clear.

² Besides, the allusion to the omen in l. 204 may be considered as a first foreboding of success for the whole expedition. Of course, we have only the bare statement that the *smotere ceorlas* "hæl scēawedon," but it is evidently understood from the context that the omens were indeed favourable. See Klaeber's note, *op. cit.* p. 134.

³ This is the most explicit case of anticipation, as a tragic issue is not only predicted for Beowulf, as in the other instances, but for the dragon as well; it is clearly stated that both "are fated to endure the end of their transitory days."

⁴ That the emphasis is laid on the fact that the hero got safely through every trouble and severe conflict "oð ðone ānne dæg, þē hē wið þām wyrme gewegan sceolde" may really seem to imply that it was no longer going to be the case. Likewise the second passage, where it is stated twice that Beowulf spoke for the last time ("niehstan siðe," l. 2,511; "hindeman siðe," l. 2,517), also seems to point to his imminent death. This, however, is more doubtful, because it may simply mean that he spoke for the last time before going to fight, without any further implication. Of course, it is not his last speech in the poem, but it is in fact his last address to the body of his retainers.

⁵ "Beorscealca sum" ultimately means "the warriors," as Hoops proves (*Kommentar*, p. 154). The singular meaning, which seems at first sight tempting in view of the fact that the monster kills only Aeschere (cf. too l. 1,251), is now definitely rejected.

⁶ The allusion is first to their ignorance of fate, "geðsceaft grimme" (1,233-5), then to their being "fūs ond fæge" (1,240-1)—the connotation of *fūs* here, i.e. ready [for death] (cf. *wælfūs*, 2,420), makes it a variant of *fæge*—finally to the sorrow with which one, i.e. Aeschere, would pay for his "evening rest" (1,251-2).

indicating "by a characteristic anticipation the final triumph of the Danes over their enemies."¹ All these anticipations are, of course, quite incompatible with an element of surprise in the story (which is not the case with those of the second group).

With this in mind, we may wonder whether that complete disregard of suspense (which, we saw, was not considered as a defect) brings any positive counterpart which might justify it. Let us first observe that the element of suspense is generally used at its best in a short story, and is thus more likely to be expected in a tale after the manner of Poe than in a *roman fleuve*; but, apart from other evident objections, the mere fact that in *Beowulf* anticipation is also used in a short episodic tale, and not only in the main story, shows that an answer must be sought in another direction.

Subjects drawn from history, for instance, especially if they are dealing with famous heroes and widely known facts, almost necessarily imply a laying aside of the element of suspense (at least in its purest sense), unless, of course—as is often the case when they are transposed on the stage—the author expects us by a kind of tacit convention to veil the "historical mirror" in our memory. Yet, as we may realize when we come to consider it, we often lose nothing in spite of our knowing the issue beforehand, and in certain cases, even, the story seems all the more effective. How can we account for it? There is, above all, one main theme which is capable of bearing more emphasis, of being more elaborately worked out if the scheme of anticipation is adopted instead of the technique of surprise. It is the rôle of destiny. This is easy to show if, to simplify matters, one chooses any concrete case setting forth the death of a hero in some great enterprise. Here an objection immediately arises, which must be dealt with first. Will not the part of destiny appear the more striking when the fall of the hero is managed so as to make it the more sensational and unexpected? Undoubtedly—but it is more likely to enter our mind for a very short time and once only, just after the thing happens; whereas if we know from the outset that the hero is doomed, it may actually take possession of our mind throughout the whole struggle, until the final blow is dealt, and our feeling of the impending doom may render that

¹ Klaeber, *op. cit.* p. 165. Hoops, moreover, has exactly the same interpretation: cf. *Kommentar*, p. 134. I am not sure whether ll. 1,146-7, "Fin eft beoat swordbealo sliðen æt his selfes hām," could also be considered as an anticipation of Finn's death. The only objection is its being too near to his actual death (1,152-3) to be a real anticipation.

struggle the more tragic, if it is adequately handled. Such an example of what may be gained by the use of anticipation, however imperfect and schematic, gives us at least the gist of what we are now going to develop in the case of *Beowulf*.

That the use of anticipations (the term being restricted to those of the first group, unless further specified) gives the *Beowulf* poet a means of emphasizing the part played by fate and makes it the more pervasive, is proved by an investigation of the two following points. First of all, it is quite evident, as Schneider remarks,¹ that it is at times a character of the poem and at times the poet himself who discloses the future; but it is true—and this is the remarkable fact—only for what we called “allusive” anticipations. In that group of anticipations with which we are dealing now the future is never revealed by a character, but only by the poet. Let us examine the clearest instances, the three great fights of the hero. There is no trace of anticipation in any of Beowulf’s speeches before the Grendel fight, not even a bare hint. The hero, when speaking of the future, always takes care to express not merely the possibility of being overcome, but the essential uncertainty of the issue, leaving it then to God to decide the outcome: “ðær gelyfan sceal Dryhtnes dōme sē þe hine dēað nimeð” (440-1); and farther on, “siþðan wītig God on swā hwæþere hond . . . mārðo dēme, swā him gemet þince” (685-7). Likewise before attacking Grendel’s mother the hero makes a kind of oral testament, in case, he says, “ic æt þearfe þinre scolde aldre linnan” (1,477-8), or “mec hilde nime” (1,481). So it is again before the dragon’s fight (2,526-37).

One feels, of course, that this attitude is mainly explained by the necessities of characterization, as the author could not very well show, for instance, in the Beowulf he had in mind an excess of confidence in his own victory or a too obvious underestimation of the strength of his opponent leading him to take for granted the favourable issue of the fight;² but this is no real objection, because even then it would not be a genuine case of anticipation, but simply a sort of boasting, familiar with a certain type of epic hero. Had the author wanted, he would have found more than one way to suggest the outcome even in one of Beowulf’s speeches, whereas he takes great care to leave it in complete suspense. Moreover, the objection would fall in the case of Hrothgar, who is not one of the contending

¹ Schneider, *op. cit.* p. 15.

² Furthermore, this would not have given him the opportunity of introducing a Christian element, in showing Beowulf reverently submitting to God’s decree.

parties and might easily have provided an opportunity for anticipation. Yet, just like Beowulf, he does not show the slightest presentiment, and ends one of his addresses to the hero with the conditional "gif þū þæt ellenweorc aldre gedigest" (661). And Aeschere's death, for instance, which, we have seen, is clearly foretold to us by the author, takes him totally unawares. Finally, any of the "wise men" in Hrothgar's or Beowulf's court might have been a fitting agent for uttering every possible shade of prediction concerning the great events, whereas they foretell nothing at all.

It is clear, therefore, that in all the happenings connected with the main story the author obviously wanted to leave no trace of foreboding in any of the characters in the poem (although some are endowed in other cases with an unusual sense of prescience), so that the important issues are left for them in a perfect state of indecision; whereas, on the other hand, he is obviously so eager to have us know what is going to happen that he sometimes takes care to tell it no less than three or four times in advance! Now this is precisely because of the singular stress with which the part of fate then imposes itself on our minds: we see the protagonist make plans and engage in some terrible and decisive fight of which he leaves the issue to God; we see and almost hear the monster lurking in the night, jerking the door, and, grim and greedy, entering the dark hall with an awful light in his eyes; and all the time we know whom fate is going to strike, and eagerly watch for the blow. We know, but they don't, and thus they appear to us as the playthings of fate; we feel and are constantly reminded of its looming above those mortal heads, above the sleepy warrior lying down for rest unconscious of his doom. And that knowledge, which makes us partake in some way of the secrets of destiny, singularly enhances the tragic element in the dragon's fight—each of the recurring forebodings of the future tolls like the knell of parting life.

That this set of anticipations gives the *Beowulf* poet a powerful means of emphasizing the part of fate is confirmed by the second point, to which we shall now turn, and which is perhaps the decisive factor. If we examine the way in which these anticipations are expressed it is rather striking to observe how they are almost all connected specifically with the idea of fate (or, for that matter, God; but, as Klaeber remarks, "the functions of fate and God seem quite parallel,"¹ and this is not the place to engage in a discussion as to

¹ Klaeber, *op. cit.* p. xlix.

their relative importance).¹ Typical examples are those preceding the Grendel fight: "Ac him Dryhten forgeaf wigspēda gewiofu" (696-7); "Ne wæs þæt wyrd þā gēn, þæt hē . . ." (734-5). Just as obvious are those announcing Beowulf's death: "Sceolde lāndaga . . . ende gebīdan," which means no less than "he was fated to endure the end of his transitory days" (2,341-2); and farther on: "wyrd ungemete nēah, sē ðone gomelan grētan sceolde" (2,420-1), or "swā him wyrd ne gescrāf hrēð æt hilde" (2,574-5). Likewise, before the arrival of Grendel's mother, the warriors in the hall "wyrd ne cūpon, geōsceaft grimme" (1,233-4), as they lay down "fūs ond fæge" (1,241). And other instances could easily be quoted. Moreover, one should not leave unnoticed the skilful way in which the expression of the idea is varied to give it a less rigid mould. But be it simply the bare *sceolde* (was fated to) or the more expressive *walfūs* and *fæge*, the word *gewif* (lit. "web of destiny"), still rich in its associations, or the rather pregnant *geōsceaft*, all point directly or indirectly to almighty *wyrd*.

What the presentation of fate has gained by the use of anticipations is now clear enough and hardly needs further comment. Now, has it any special relevance in the Beowulf poem? Decidedly, fate is given an important and pervasive part throughout the poem. The fact that it is used side by side with God, or even at times subordinated to Him, is merely evidence of the blending of Christian and heathen elements so characteristic of *Beowulf*; but there it is, constantly present in our mind, lurking or striking, and the emphasis brought about by the repeated anticipations potently helps towards furthering the representation of fate, hovering above the whole drama. This not only justifies the way anticipation is used by the poet, but also makes it quite pertinent in the individual poem, and, above all, actually betrays the hand of the artist.

Let us now turn to the second group, formed by what we called

¹ I venture, however, to suggest it as possible that the author intended to use, and make the most of, fate, for which he had a long tradition and which he probably found admirably suited to his purpose, but introduced God as well, and in one or two cases thought it fit to subordinate fate to Him, thus adjusting Christian to pagan elements.

There is one typical instance at least which seems to betray a similar process. It is about the treasure buried for a thousand years: the author tells us that it "was enclosed with a spell" which was so powerful a protection that "no man could reach the ring-hall" in the cave where it lay hidden, and then takes care to add "except God Himself," followed by a rather awkward recognition of God's power, faintly smacking of an afterthought (3,051-7). Klaeber calls it delightfully a "saving clause of Christian tenor" *op. cit.* p. 213).

"allusive" anticipations, *i.e.* referring to events beyond the scene of action of the poem. A brief mention at least is not unnecessary, and will allow us immediately to reach a conclusion. The first instance we meet very early in the poem, with the description of the beautiful hall erected by king Hrothgar: Heorot towered high in all its splendour, yet "heaðowylma bād, lāðan liges" (82-3). Whether the burning occurred during the Heatho-Bard conflict, as Klaeber assumes,¹ is immaterial; but another allusion to the catastrophe in store is to be found in the midst of the Grendel fight: it was a wonder, we are told, that the hall could stand the furious onslaughts of the champion and the monster without falling to the ground, but it was so skilfully built that the Scyldings did not think it could be destroyed by man "nymþe liges fæþm swulge on swaþule" (781-2). At the same time we have a first hint of a future war brought about by the deadly hate of "son-in-law and father-in-law" (83-5), which only a much later anticipation made by Beowulf himself in his report to Hygelac makes clear: Hrothgar has settled an old feud by resorting to one of the pacific methods current in his times, and, using his daughter as "freoðuwebbe," has promised her to the son of his old enemy, King Froda, killed in the course of the feud. But even in those times pacific methods did not always yield permanent results, and Beowulf clearly utters his misgivings: "Oft seldan hwær æfter lēodhryre lýtle hwile bongār būgeð, þeah sēo brýd duge" (2,029-31). And his forebodings as to the fragility of the alliance are stressed again when he describes in a precise prophecy how the sentiment of revenge is going to prevail and make the renewal of the bloody feud inevitable.

Another set of anticipations centres in the relations between Hrothgar and his nephew Hrothulf. It begins again with a mere hint, during the great feast celebrating Beowulf's victory over Grendel; the places of honour were held by Hrothgar and Hrothulf, the hall was full of friends, and the Scyldings had not yet contrived any treachery (1,018-19). The allusion is sufficiently veiled so as not immediately to designate Hrothulf himself. After the Finn episode has taken place, however, a new, although merely suggested,

¹ Klaeber, *op. cit.* p. 128. The allusion to that conflict follows immediately afterwards, and should not be separated, according to Klaeber, from ours. Hoops is less positive, and finds an objection in the Heorot passage in *Widsith* (Hoops, *op. cit.* p. 24). Chambers thinks it more probable that the allusion to the burning of the hall "refers to the later struggle among the kin of Hrothgar, when the hall was burnt over Hrothulf's head" (A. J. Wyatt and R. W. Chambers ed., *Beowulf with the Finnsburg Fragment*, Cambridge, 1920, p. 7).

anticipation is much less cryptic: wine was being poured out of wonderful cups, mirth filled the convivial hearts when the queen turned to where uncle and nephew were sitting—"þā gýt wæs hiera sib ætgædere, æghwylc ððrum trýwe" (1,164-5). This time we definitely know that the treachery is going to arise between those two, but this is all; the anticipation never becomes more explicit, and what little more we know of the story we know only from other sources. With two or three delicate strokes the poet further manages to convey the impression that the queen herself is dimly suspecting Hrothulf's loyalty (1,180-7, 1,219-20, 1,226-8). Thus, to use Klaeber's words, the rupture of the "harmonious union" between Hrothgar and Hrothulf is indeed intimated "with admirable subtlety."¹

The last and important series of anticipations is no longer concerned with Hrothgar and his environment, but shifts to Beowulf's own people. In his long reign Beowulf was so mighty that none of the neighbouring kings dared attack him.² But now that the hero is dead, and the news spread around, the outbreak of war is to be expected (2,911-14); the faith and friendship of the Swedish people, the enemies of yore, is anything but sure (2,921-2), and it is very likely that they will attack the valiant Geats (2,999-3,007). And, finally, this culminates in the magnificent piece of epic prophecy foreshadowing the ultimate downfall of the Geats (3,021-7).

Now this survey throws into light the fundamental character which perfectly unites all these allusive anticipations: the implication that everything in this world is transient, that, to use a leit-motiv of the poem, "gyrn [cymeð] æfter gomene," affliction after joy. All these are anticipations of sad events and even catastrophes. There is no single note of hope in that gloomy series of Cassandra-like, yet unobtrusive, prophecies. Conflagration, renewal of bloody feuds, hate, thirst for revenge, treachery among kinsfolk, extermination of peoples—these are the sinister images called forth from an apocalyptic future! They are relieved, however, of what might be too oppressive in them by the lightness of the touch, the sometimes delicate suggestive quality of the anticipation.

That the ultimate object of these anticipations is to suggest the transience of everything in this world—and this makes of them a close unit—is further brought into relief by the carefully chosen

¹ Klaeber, *op. cit.* p. xxxi.

² So the hero says in his last speech but one: *cf.* ll. 2,732-6.

moment at which they are called up. It is always when something looks or is described as splendid, stable, or peaceful, or when friendly people are in the midst of rejoicings, that they take place. Thus the future burning of the royal seat is predicted after its being presented as unmatched in beauty and solidity, a paragon of architecture. The fine prophetic picture of the Heatho-Bard episode is evoked in Beowulf's mind by the recollection of Hrothgar's daughter, Freawaru, handing the costly drinking vessels to the carousing warriors. Hrothulf's subsequent treachery is alluded to when the harmony at the king's court seems perfect, when the hall brightens with revelry and the convivial mirth is at its highest. This skilful element of contrast evidently heightens the intended effect. And the climax comes at last with the prophesied downfall of Beowulf's own people, the final pessimistic picture after which the poem may close.¹ Thus we know, indeed, with the Wanderer that

Eall is earfoðlic eorþan rice
onwendeð wyrda gesceaft weoruld under heofonum.²

What makes the use of allusive anticipations the more justified from an artistic standpoint is that the mood thus powerfully and skilfully brought forth merges in and enhances the effect of one of the basic and essential moods pervading the poem, the mood of grief and sadness. Whether that "prevailing Teutonic mood"³ may partly or ultimately be due to the fact that the *Beowulf* is a literary product of an apparently highly refined society, perhaps verging on decadence, is a philosophical question which must be left open here. But it can hardly be denied, as a conclusion, that, owing partly to the emphasis they bring on the rôle of fate and partly to the mood they call forth, the anticipations assume an important function in the architecture of the poem, and, thanks to the deft and subtle hand with which they are used, decidedly contribute to the group of qualities which make the *Beowulf* a work of art.

¹ There is one more hint, however, in the song of lament (3,152-5), and although the motive is, of course, quite conventional there, it is no less in keeping with the final set of anticipations, of which it might be considered as the last slight touch.

² *The Wanderer*, ll. 106-7.

³ Klaeber, *op. cit.* p. lx.

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

THE STAGING OF *KING LEAR*

AMONG Shakespeare's plays *King Lear* is peculiar in the simplicity of its staging; that is, in the very modest demands it makes for machinery or even properties. It is a feature that naturally attracted the attention of Mr. Granville-Barker, who writes in his most illuminating Preface that "But for Edgar's monument 'above,' some need for the masking of Lear's 'state,' and again for the discovery of the joint-stools and bench in the scene of the mock trial, the play could indeed be acted upon a barer stage than was the Globe's."¹ A few details will make the point clear.

The great opening scene certainly calls for a throne or chair of state, and possibly for a table on which the map could be spread out. It would be natural to dispose these on the inner stage; and in that case the conversation between Kent and Gloucester with which the scene begins would naturally take place on the front stage and the traverse be opened only at l. 34. But there is no "discovery" of persons; Lear walks on: "The king is coming." Thus the inner stage could be dispensed with, the throne being set in place before the play began and removed at the end of the scene.

In II. i Edgar is hiding in his brother's "lodging," which is "above": "Brother, a word; descend: brother, I say!" (l. 21). But there is no indication that Edgar is visible to the audience till he enters below; the balcony would not necessarily be required.

In III. iv Poor Tom has to emerge from the hovel, but evidently one of the stage doors would serve.

The scene of the mock trial, III. vi, demands some furniture—

¹ *Prefaces to Shakespeare*, 1927, I. 220. He suggests, perhaps not too fancifully, that "Shakespeare minimised such location as his theatre did afford him to give the play spaciousness of action, and to magnify his characters the more in isolating them from needless detail of circumstance." But Shakespeare may have been turning chance limitations to account. He also adds a footnote to the effect that "There are one or two signs that the stage to which the Folio version was fitted differed a little from that of the Quarto." I should be interested to know what these signs are, for I have not observed them, and they might be important as affording a hint as to the performance that lay behind what I take to be undoubtedly the "reported" text of the Quarto.

a bench and a joint-stool—and there must be a couch of some sort concealed by hangings: "lie here and rest awhile", "draw the curtains" (ll. 87, 89); moreover, the king is not in view when Gloucester re-enters. This would ordinarily imply the use of the inner stage. But the joint-stool may be imaginary—the expression "I took you for a joint-stool" (l. 54) was proverbial—and bench and couch may be one. All that is really needed is a narrow bench over which the arras could be let fall. This could be arranged on any make-shift stage. It is noteworthy that Lear is picked up bodily and carried off by Kent and the Fool: "take him in thy arms", "Come, help to bear thy master" (ll. 95, 107). There is no hint that the traverse is used.

The next scene, that of Gloucester's blinding, requires a chair: "To this chair bind him" (l. 34). It may have been left over from III. iv and be removed at the end along with the body of the servant.

IV. vii, Lear's awaking in Cordelia's tent (as editors have it), is a most interesting scene. The natural way to present it would be for Lear to be lying on a couch on the back stage and to be "discovered" at l. 20. There is nothing in the text to contradict this, and so editors and producers have generally conceived it. But the Folio is quite explicit with the direction "Enter Lear in a chaire carried by Seruants"—rather a clumsy way to bring on a sleeping patient, but the only one if the use of the traverse be denied.¹

In the last scene Lear must have somewhere to lay Cordelia's body, but the bench behind the arras would again suffice.

And this is all—with one important exception, namely, the stocks in which Kent is confined in II. ii. Now, I take it that there would be nothing unexpected in finding stocks near the gate of a nobleman's country house as a warning to rogues and vagabonds. It is a lonely house with nothing except a few outbuildings for miles around. The natural thing would be to "discover" them on the back stage, and have Kent put in them there. Then at the end of the scene

¹ The Quarto has no entry for Lear at all, but it bears out the arrangement in so far that only "Cordelia, Kent and Doctor" appear at the opening of the scene. Granville-Barker (p. 182) has a characteristic explanation of the staging at this point: Lear must be carried on in a chair, "For when he comes to himself it is to find that he is royally attired and as if seated on his throne again." This is picturesque, but once again it strikes me rather as illustrating Shakespeare's masterly way of extracting dramatic effect from theatrical necessity than as itself conditioning the arrangement. A. C. Bradley (*Shakespearean Tragedy*, 1904, p. 254) protested against the absurdity of representing Lear in bed. Of course he is not in bed, nor is he in his night gown: he is "arrayed" (l. 20).

the traverse could be closed, Edgar could speak his short soliloquy before it, and it could be withdrawn once more to disclose Kent still in the stocks in the scene that follows. This is the arrangement assumed by modern editors, who make II. ii, iii, and iv three distinct scenes. But it is not how the action is arranged in the Folio, and it is not how Shakespeare wrote it. As the text stands, Cornwall twice gives the order to "Fetch forth the stocks!" and again to "Bring away the stocks!" (ll. 132, 140, 146); while the Folio adds the explicit direction, "Stocks brought out." This looks like deliberate avoidance of the inner stage. But unless the inner stage with its traverse is used, the stocks must necessarily remain in view until Kent is released in scene iv. This is actually what happens in the Folio, in which II. ii comprises the whole of the action which modern editors divide between scenes ii to iv. There is nothing impossible in this, for Edgar can perfectly well come on and speak his lines at the front of the stage while Kent quietly slumbers in the background. But it creates two distinct absurdities: first, that of the fugitive Edgar's appearing by daylight at his father's front door to discuss what disguise he shall adopt; secondly, that of a single scene that begins before dawn and continues till nightfall. This is what the Folio division involves. And the text, while it does not, of course, necessitate this particular arrangement, seems to have been deliberately so written as to make it possible. For this there must surely have been some cogent reason, and the only imaginable one is that the rear stage was not available.

Now, all this means that the play was written, not with the ordinary theatre in view, but for a plain stage with no alcove and probably no balcony, and that the act and scene divisions preserved in the Folio were designed for a similar stage and presumably for the same occasion. The only performance of *King Lear* of which we have actual record is that which was given at court on 26 December, 1606.¹ Was the play specially written for that occasion? Considering how many of the plays performed on the London stage were also acted at court, it is very difficult to suppose that this afforded fewer scenic facilities than the public theatres. Of course, the court was not fixed at any one place, and the same conveniences would not be everywhere available; but we are explicitly informed that the performance of *Lear* was at Whitehall, where ample resources

¹ I understand that Professor C. J. Sisson has found evidence of a provincial performance in 1609, but he has not published it.

must have been to hand.¹ While, therefore, it seems probable that the peculiarities of staging in *King Lear* are to be explained by its having been written with some particular performance in view, that performance can hardly have been the one given at court on St. Stephen's Night, 1606.²

But, however that may be, another and perhaps, from the critical point of view, a more important conclusion can be drawn with equal confidence. It is this: that since the text appears to have been deliberately written in such a way as to render possible the unusual scenic arrangement adopted in the Folio, we must suppose that the act and scene divisions there indicated are actually those of the original performance. That there is no trace of them in the Quarto need not surprise us if, as many believe, it contains a reported text not directly dependent upon the prompt-book. In the case, therefore, of at least one play we have good reason to believe that the divisions found in the Folio were introduced neither on the occasion of a late revival after Shakespeare had ceased to control the production of his plays, nor by a literary editor in the collection of 1623, but that they go back to the original production of the piece.

W. W. GREG.

"BEN JONSON IN DRAYTON'S POEMS" ³

I

MR. SHORT's title hardly does justice to the imaginative quality of his writing. A better heading would be "Biography by Conjecture; or Guesses about Jonson, Drayton, and Lady Bedford." Mr. Short is puzzled—as we all are—about Drayton's loss of Lady Bedford's favour. The facts about it are not known: Mr. Short supplies them.

He assumes that "deceitfull" Cerberon, the "beastly clowne to vile of to be spoken" in the eighth "Eglog" of Drayton's *Poemes*

¹ Sir Edmund Chambers confirms this view. In a private letter he writes: "The court was at Whitehall by 1 November 1606, and does not seem to have moved again until the following spring. There was not yet a permanent theatre at court, and I think we may take it that *Lear* was given in the Great Hall. Here the Offices of Revels and Works could certainly fit up some temporary erection corresponding to the threefold public theatre stage. . . . I should suppose that anything put up for 26 December would stand throughout the winter's performances, although the mask on 6 January, 1607, might entail some rearrangement."

² There is, moreover, some reason to suppose that *Lear* was already on the stage the previous winter.

³ See *R.E.S.*, April 1940, pp. 149-58.

Lyrick and Pastoral (1606)—the man who did the mischief with Lady Bedford—is Jonson. He even assumes that Jonson tacitly accepted the identification. It is difficult to understand such a misreading of Jonson's character. The *Expostulation with Inigo Jones* would have been child's play compared with the tornado Ben would have let loose on Drayton if he had realized that he was the object of this insult. Why should Mr. Short assume that Cerberon was a poet? There is not the slightest hint in Drayton's context that Cerberon had ever written anything. He is more likely to have been some insolent courtier who despised poets and had a grudge against Drayton. "Beastly clowns," in any literal sense of the words, did not enter Lady Bedford's circle.

Jonson told Drummond that Drayton "feared him." So, according to Mr. Short, the frightened Drayton, instead of keeping quiet, provoked with intolerable insult the man he was afraid of. Further, he paid the "beastly clown" the compliment of telling him in the *Epistle to Henry Reynolds* that he was "long lord of the theatre" and a recognized master of tragedy and comedy.

The estimate of Lady Bedford shows equal want of perspective. Mr. Short has even created for her a new court office—Mistress of the Revels: "By 1606 she had attained virtual control over the brilliant Jacobean court masques. In 1604 she chose Daniel to write the first court masque of the new reign, and in 1605 and 1606 exerted an influential, if indeed not final, word in the election of Jonson as author." "Having given Daniel one chance at masque-writing . . . apparently" she "had decided that none but Jonson should write the subsequent ones." "By 1606" Jonson's "friendship with Lady Bedford had ripened through their collaboration in the court masques."¹

The one grain of fact in this travesty of stage history is that Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses* was performed at court because Lady Bedford had recommended him to the Queen. As for Lady Bedford's "deciding" that Jonson should replace Daniel, it is sufficient to point out that Jonson's work was known to the Queen before *The Masque of Blackness*. He had produced the charming *Entertainment at Althorp* for Lord Spencer in June 1603, when the Queen and Prince Henry were travelling to London for the coronation, and the *Highgate Entertainment* of James and Anne for Sir William Cornwallis on May Day 1604. As for "giving Daniel one

¹ *Loc. cit.* pp. 153, 156.

chance," the inferiority of his masque as a work of art was a sufficient reason for preferring Jonson. As for Lady Bedford's "collaboration" with Jonson, I infer that Mr. Short is using this word laxly in the sense of "association." But if he means that Lady Bedford helped to write *The Masque of Blackness* and *Hymenaei*, the suggestion is one of the wildest ever made even about Jonson.

Lastly there are some unfounded speculations about Drayton and masque-writing. Drayton, a working playwright from 1597 to 1602, wrote no masques. Mr. Short has an idea, entirely unjustified, that he wanted to write them. Drayton's violent language about Selena (Lady Bedford) and Cerberon in the 1609 "Eglog" was, he thinks, prompted by his making a futile appeal to her to gratify this unheard-of ambition of his. "If, then, he . . . petitioned Lady Bedford for her support, this time as a masque-writer, we can understand the rage he felt at being . . . rejected." Well may Mr. Short add, "But this, of course, is guesswork." So is his entire article, and it is a painful example of the way in which literary history should not be written.

PERCY SIMPSON.

II

Mr. R. W. Short identifies the "Cerberon" of Drayton's Pastorals of 1606 with Ben Jonson and in the course of his argument he makes one or two statements about Drayton which require correction.

(1) That Drayton wrote no new poems for several years after 1597. Five of the epistles in *Englands Heroicall Epistles* were first published in 1598, and one in 1599. *Idea* in 1599 contains twenty-five new sonnets and *Englands Helicon* (1600) contains four new poems by Drayton. Further, we have Meres' word in 1598 that Drayton was already writing *Poly-Olbion*. The Drayton who "slaved as a poorly paid drudge of Henslowe" (p. 150) from 1597 to 1602 requires some modification. It does not accord with Drayton's own definition of his motives:

In pride of Wit, when high desire of fame
Gave Life and Courage to my lab'ring Pen
. . . With those the thronged Theaters that presse,
I in the Circuit for the Lawrell strove.¹

(2) That Drayton began to dedicate his works to Walter Aston in 1603. The first dedication to Aston appeared in *Englands*

¹ *Idea*, in *Poems*, 1605; sonnet 47.

Heroicall Epistles, 1602, before the Epistles of the Black Prince and the Countess of Salisbury.

(3) That the stanza quoted from *The Barrons Wars*, and especially the line "Maugre the Momists, and Satyricke sects," hints at a rival poet. Such references are very common throughout Drayton's poetry (see, for example, "proud Momus" in line 1,010 of *Endimion and Phoebe*), and read like general complaints of envy and detraction. (Further, if there were reference to a rival, would not the context suggest that it should be a rival in Aston's favour?)

These points only slightly affect Mr. Short's main argument. In this he starts from the assumption that Cerberon is a poet; but there is really nothing in Drayton's lines to justify this. All we are told is that Selena cleaves to Cerberon, who is deceitful and a beastly clown too vile to be spoken of; the words "vulgar breath" may or may not refer to him. The phrase "beastly clownes" is twice used by Drayton, in the 6th eclogue of 1606 and in *The Shepheards Sirena*. (See *Works*, ed. J. W. Hebel, II. 548, III. 165.) Both contexts suggest not poets but enemies of poetry. The evidence for some animosity between Drayton and Jonson is, of course, indisputable, and was strengthened by Mr. Short's previous note on "Jonson's Sanguine Rival";¹ but Drayton's calling Jonson a "beastly clowne to[o] vile of to be spoken" does not seem to me to fit into the picture. "The Vision of Ben Jonson" is playful burlesque, not vindictive satire; the object of the burlesque is not so much Drayton's poems as what readers expect commendatory verses to be like.

Since Mr. Short concludes with a reference to "greate Olcon" in the 8th eclogue, I may perhaps add that in *T.L.S.*, November 27, 1937, I argued that Olcon, both here and in *The Shepheards Sirena*, represents James I.

KATHLEEN TILLOTSON.

DEFOE AND THE EDINBURGH SOCIETY FOR THE REFORMATION OF MANNERS

IN the minutes of the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners there is preserved in manuscript in the Edinburgh University Library, the following entry under the date of March 7, 1707:

Bailie Duncan reported he had some days been speaking to Mr. De

¹ *R.E.S.*, XV, 59, pp. 315-19.

Foe about a correspondence with the Societies for Reformation in England of which he understood Mr. De Foe to be a member, and Mr. De Foe desiring to be admitted a member of this Society approved, declaring the same and also his willingness to establish the aforesaid correspondence with the Societies in England.¹

At the next regular meeting of the Society, held on April 3, 1707, Defoe was admitted as a member. There is special mention of his admission in the minutes of that date :

This day Mr. DeFoe was admitted a member of this Society and recorded. The Society nominated Mr. Eliot, Mr. DeFoe, and Mr. Drummond to prepare and draw up the overture anent a correspondence, and Mr. Drummond chosen to wait on the correspondent meeting.²

Defoe was present at all of the remaining April meetings. At the meeting held on April 8, " Mr. DeFoe ended with prayer."³ At the last April meeting, which convened on the 29th, Defoe reported on his correspondence with the London Societies for the Reformation of Manners.

Mr. DeFoe having reported that he had written to some members of Societies in London for Reformation. They had returned him answer they were willing to send some of their manuals which they distribute for encouraging the work of Reformation and to give them to this Society. The Society recommended to him gratefully to acquaint them they accept of their proposal.⁴

Between May and November, 1707, Defoe was rather irregular in his attendance. He was present on May 6 ; then there is no record of his attendance until August 12, at which meeting " Dan DeFoe and Nicol Spence each prayed their turn."⁵ His next appearance was on October 21, when " Mr. DeFoe began with prayer."⁶ That he had not as yet become indifferent to the work of the Society, the minutes of October 21, clearly show.

Mr. DeFoe presented some prints sent to him from Mr. Thomas Morrison in name of the Societies in London. The Society named Mr. Lindsay, Eliot and Spence to consider how to dispose upon the papers and what returns to make to the Society in England, Mr. DeFoe, Eliot and Spence to draw the draught of letters to be sent to friends in England about the work, and they are to meet to-morrow at 3 afternoon in Mr. DeFoe's chambers and report.⁷

¹ Register of Resolutions and Proceedings of a Society for the Reformation of Manners, Laing MSS. III. 339. (I am indebted to Dr. H. L. Sharp, of the Edinburgh University Library, for bringing this manuscript to my attention.)

² *Ibid.*, p. 8.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

⁷ *Ibid.*

His name appears in the lists of members who were present on November 4, 11, and 18.¹ Apparently Defoe did not attend any more meetings of the Society after November 18, 1707. The following is a complete copy of the minutes of that meeting :

Edinb. November 18, 1707.

Dean of Guild Brown, Mr. DeFoe, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Eliot, Mr. Spence.

The letter to the Societies in England read and Mr. Drummond proposed this day to sign the same and to give to Mr. DeFoe.²

It would appear from the minutes of the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners that Defoe ceased to be active in the affairs of the Society after December, 1707. Certainly his work for the Ministry would have prevented him from attending the meetings with any degree of regularity. Again, his occasional absence from Edinburgh would account for many absences. Yet, after making a liberal allowance for the time consumed in his private affairs, in his writings and in his semi-official duties which sometimes called him away from Edinburgh, he still had during the years 1708, 1709, and 1710 many opportunities to meet with the Edinburgh Society had he wished to do so. No ; Defoe withdrew from active participation in the work of the Edinburgh Society because he could no longer support its policies. That this was the main reason the *Review* for April 9, 1709, makes perfectly clear.

. . . " It will be none of my business to exclaim against the poor despicable wretches, whose oaths, drunkenness, and other wickedness are the common subject of our Societies for Reformation. . . .

" If you will reform the Nation, you that call yourselves reformers, bear with me to tell you, you must first reform yourselves—, and I must, as I have done formerly in England, make a solemn protest, and I here take instruments in the hands of the whole nation that it is unreasonable and unjust, an injury to the common people, and a dishonour to the gentry, and nobility to make laws, acts of Parliament, proclamations, declarations, city laws or burgh-laws against vice and immorality, while you execute the laws upon the poor, mean, and common people only, and yourselves go unpunished in the open commission of the same. This has been the grievance in England ; if it should spread into Scotland, it must have the same ill consequences. . . .

" But while you punish the poor, and the rich go free, while you put the laws into the hands of men of vice to execute upon the vitious, while

¹ Register of Resolutions and Proceedings of a Society for the Reformation of Manners, Laing MSS. III. 339

² *Ibid.*

magistrates commit the crimes they punish, you must expect to finish no reformation in Scotland, any more than they have in England.¹

These remarks were addressed primarily to the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners, whose membership comprised "persons of all qualities and stations, especially those of honour and interest in city or country."² Prominent among the members from 1707 to 1710 were Adam Brown, Lord Provost of Edinburgh in 1710, John Duncan, one of the Bailies, James Pringle, Ensign of the Town Guard, George Drummond, one time Provost, James Hart and John Hamilton, highly respected clergymen, Adam Freer, a well-known physician, Nicol Spence, Clerk to the Presbytery of Edinburgh, and Alex Cunningham, advocate. And in this register of members appears the name of "Daniel D DeFoe."³

We may be certain that Defoe, the newly elected member from England, on reading the "2nd Rule" of this Scottish branch of the Society for the Reformation of Manners, entertained high hopes for its programme; for in part the "2nd Rule" read: "We acknowledge it our duty and shall make it our endeavour in the first place to order our own conversations and families, so that we may not be found in any of those faults which we desire to be reformed in others." But he was soon to discover in the Edinburgh Society the same shortcomings for which he had earlier censured the London Societies for the Reformation of Manners. Here, as in London, members were ever reporting on the wickedness of the common people; the vices of the upper classes were, in the main, overlooked. For some two years, however, Defoe refrained from openly attacking the Edinburgh Society. After February 2, 1709, he apparently found it difficult to remain silent. For on that date the Edinburgh Presbytery had voted to take under consideration the case of "Alexander Cunningham, barrister," a distinguished member of the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners, who had been accused of adultery. No word of reproof came from the Society. We are correct, I believe, in assuming that it was the failure of the Society to discipline Cunningham that furnished the immediate occasion for Defoe's attack in the *Review* to which I have already referred.

In spite of his withdrawal from the Edinburgh Society, Defoe

¹ Defoe's *Review*, vol. vi, Number 4, April 7, 1709 (Edinburgh Edition), Facsimile Book 16, ed. A. W. Secord, Facsimile Text Society (New York, 1938), pp. 15-16.

² Register of Resolutions (etc.), 3rd Rule, p. 6.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

was evidently willing to work with individual members and outsiders as well who shared his views on reform. Evidence of this interest may be seen in the substantial aid which he presumably gave to Nicol Spence, his former co-worker in the Edinburgh Society, in circularizing the following notice :

There being a process depending before the Presbytery of Edinburgh against Sir Alexander C——ing of C——ter, Advocate, for the sin of adultery, which has depended for several years, and he not having obey'd, a certification given him Apud Acta, it was upon the second day of February, one thousand seven hundred and nine, found to infer contumacy. But the Presbytery forbear to proceed to censures, and waited hitherto for his compearance. But now finding that he was lately in Edinburgh, but left the place without doing anything for removing the said scandal ; the Presbytery resolved to take the matter under consideration, and he being this day thrice publicly call'd at the door, and not compearing, the Presbytery did and hereby do declare that the said Alexander C——y of C——ter, contumacious to the discipline of the church and appoint the same to be intimat from all pulpits of Edinburgh next Lord's day and be certified, that if he did not compear in this place upon the twenty-second of November next, and remove the scandal of adultry he is lying under, the Presbytery will proceed to farther censure. This by order of the said Presbytery, the Eleventh of October, one thousand seven hundred and ten years, is subscribed by

Nic Spence Cler.

The above notice was printed at the bottom of the last page of a pamphlet published some time in 1711. That Defoe had a hand in the pamphlet ¹ there can be little doubt. That the notice was inserted largely through his interest in the Cunningham case is highly probable.

Even at an earlier date Defoe seems to have been active in helping his friend Spence to give wide publicity to the notice. Support for such a conjecture may be gathered from a letter ² addressed "To Daniel DeFoe Esq. at Edinburgh" by Joseph Button, the Newcastle bookseller. The letter dated Newcastle, December 23, was an answer to Defoe's letter of December 5, 1710. In part Button writes : "In the Gazette³ of Xd^r there is something of Mr. Cunningham,

¹ *The Scots Representation to Her Majesty against setting up the common Prayer Book in Scotland* (N.D.). In a contemporary hand at the bottom of the title-page is written : "London 1711 by George Ridpath and his Associates William Carstairs mentioned in the History of the Rye House Plott and Daniell DeFoe alias Ffaugh." The "Introduction" appears to be wholly the work of DeFoe.

² MSS. 19.1.39, National Library of Scotland.

³ *The Newcastle Gazette*, which Button published in 1710. For additional information on Button, see my forthcoming paper on "DeFoe's Relations with his Northern Printers."

I suppose that is it you wou'd ha printed there in that you have sent last and you say it is in that paper." Button's letter suggests that "the something of Mr. Cunningham" was in the form of a notice or advertisement. Furthermore, the "something" appears to have been the very same matter which Defoe was anxious for the *Gazette* to print. Apparently the notice, which Defoe claimed he had sent along with some other manuscript material, had gone astray. Button having received "the something of Mr. Cunningham" from some other source had proceeded to print it in the December 10 issue of the *Gazette*. There is reasonable certainty that the Cunningham mentioned by Button was Alexander Cunningham. The only other Cunningham in the Newcastle-Edinburgh area who was attracting public attention at the time was James Cunninghame of Barns, one of the enthusiastic Scottish disciples of the French Protestant Prophets. In all of the contemporary references to this James Cunningham that I have run across the designation "Barns" or "Barnes" is never omitted. In September, 1710, Dr. George Gordon addresses him as "James Cunningham of Barns"¹; the Reverend James Webster writing to the Reverend Robert Wodrow on September 10, 1710, refers to him first as "Barnes Cunninghame" and at the end of the letter simply as "Barnes"²; the Reverend Robert Wodrow speaks of him as "Cunninghame of Barnes"³; and the title of a contemporary pamphlet reads: "A true Copy of A Letter, passed betwixt Robert Calder and Mr. James Cunninghame of Barnes concerning the trial of the Mission of these People that pass under the name of Prophets. Edinburgh 1710." On the whole, the evidence seems to indicate that "the something of Mr. Cunningham" which Button printed in the *Gazette* was the same notice which the Edinburgh Presbytery had two months earlier instructed Nicol Spence to circularize.

But Defoe was not sent to Scotland to show the Scots how to conduct their moral reform crusade. However much he may have enjoyed this rôle, he never forgot that he had other work to do. And in the pursuit of that work all other activities, save perhaps certain personal business projects, were largely secondary. Accordingly, his letter to Harley of October 10, 1710, raises the suspicion that his desire to unite himself with the Edinburgh Society for the

¹ G. D. Henderson, *Mystics of the North East*, Aberdeen, 1934, p. 286.

² Wodrow MSS, National Library of Scotland.

³ Wodrow's *Analecta*, 1, p. 309.

Reformation of Manners was not wholly motivated by his enthusiasm to take an active part in the Scottish moral reform movement.

Though I am to attend in the evening according to your order yet I could not delay sending you an account, which I received last night after I had the honour of seeing you, of the election of magistrates for the City of Edinburgh

Adam Brown, Lord Mayor
William Hutchison, Archibald Cockburn, John Hay,
Thomas Dundas, Bailies ; John Duncan, Lord Dean of
Guilds (La meme avec le Provost de Marchands a Paris);
William Dundas, Treasurer or Chamberlain

I refer their characters till evening, only hint to you that they are all but two my very particular acquaintances which will, I believe, give me occasion of influencing them very much for Her Majesty's Service.¹

Adam Brown, the newly elected Lord Provost, and John Duncan, the incoming Lord Dean of Guilds, were certainly among Defoe's "very particular acquaintances." Both were members of the Edinburgh Society for the Reformation of Manners and were present with Defoe at many of the meetings held between April and November, 1707. It was John Duncan who proposed Defoe for membership in the Society; and as late as December, 1710, Joseph Button in a letter to Defoe refers to Adam Brown as "Ye Provost who I heard you say was yr very good friend."² The "2nd Rule" of the Society expressly states that "no matter of Church or State, no not commune news shall be so much as mentioned in our Society."³ Doubtless Defoe was quite willing to wait until the meetings adjourned to talk with his "very particular acquaintances" on such matters.

Be that as it may, we now know that Defoe's criticism of the Societies for the Reformation of Manners both in England and Scotland was based on inside knowledge of their platforms and practices.

CHARLES EATON BURCH.

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF TWO SHERIDAN PLAYS

THE CAMP

It is safe to say that the "Musical Entertainment" of *The Camp* is textually the most corrupt of all Sheridan's plays. The traditional

¹ Portland MSS., vol. iv (London, 1897), p. 612.

² MSS. 19.1.39, National Library of Scotland.

³ Register of Resolutions (etc.), p. 6.

text, which descends from the badly printed and unauthorized edition of 1795, is so bad that suspicions about Sheridan's authorship have arisen. The newspapers, however, definitely ascribe *The Camp* to Sheridan, although *The London Magazine* was careful to limit his share to the "plan and dialogue"; and the only uncertainty concerns the songs. The music was by Thomas Linley, and on its publication by the Thompsons Linley prefixed the following "Advertisement":

The Words of the following Airs Trios &c., introduced in the Entertainment of the Camp are many of them taken from the Comic Opera of the Royal Merchant Set by the same Composer, some of the Musick of which was found particularly applicable to the Subject of this Piece.

On examination *The Royal Merchant*, an operatic version by Thomas Hull of Fletcher's *The Beggar's Bush*, proves to contain no less than five of the nine songs in *The Camp*. It is true there are alterations and additions, but the changes are generally trivial. It would seem, then, that Hull rather than, as Moore suggested,¹ Tickell, or, as Mr. Rhodes prefers,² Burgoyne, should be considered the co-author of *The Camp*.

The inadequacy of the printed text of *The Camp* will be brought out by a comparison of a few passages with the Larpent manuscript in the Henry E. Huntington Library:

- i. 1. 1795: *Gage*. Right—Soldiers are testy customers.

LARPENT: *Guage*. Aye, Aye! Soldiers are Tasty Customers.

- i. 2. 1795: Then should our vaunting Enemies come,
And winds and waves their cause allow,
By Freedom's Flag we'll beat our drum,
And they'll fly from the sound of our row, dow, dow.

LARPENT: Then should our Vaunting Enemies come
And Winds and Waves their Course allow
In Freedoms Cause will beat our Drum
And they'll fly at the sound of my row dow dow.

- ii. 3. 1795: *L. Gorget*. What a pity Sir Harry was not consulted.
Sir Harry. As Gad's my judge I think so; for there is
great capability in the ground.

LARPENT: *Miss Gorget*. What a pity Sir Harry wasn't Consulted!
Sir H. B. As Gad's my Judge I think so—of Brown—
for there is great Capability in the Ground.

¹ Thomas Moore, *Memoirs of the Life of the Right Honorable Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, I (1825), 194.

² R. Crompton Rhodes, *The Plays and Poems of Richard Brinsley Sheridan*, II (1928), 272.

A collation of the two texts has convinced me that the printed text is wholly unreliable, and the character of some of the mistakes—e.g. "testy" for "tasty," "cause" for "course," as above—suggests that it was obtained surreptitiously and by ear. It cannot be said that *The Camp* is a good play even in the Larpent version—which, moreover, is without the first scene of the second act and some of the verses of the songs—but at least it is not as bad as it has been made to appear.

THE CRITIC

Sheridan is said to have told his second wife that he had never sanctioned the publication of any of his plays except *The Critic* and *Pizarro*. In the case of *The Critic* he was presumably referring to the editions issued by T. Becket in 1781 and the following years, to which he himself contributed a dedication to Mrs. Greville. The Becket text has, therefore, and rightly, become the accepted text of *The Critic*. I wish, however, to call attention to three other texts which date respectively from 1779, 1782, and 1826: the Larpent manuscript (now in the Huntington Library), the Drury Lane prompt-book (now in the Harvard Library), and Daniel's edition in *Cumberland's British Theatre*.

The Larpent manuscript was only submitted to the Licensor on October 29, 1779, that is, on the day preceding the first performance; it represents, therefore, the first acting version of the play. The text of the second and third acts is similar to the Frampton Court manuscript which was published by Fraser Rae,¹ but the first act contains a number of passages which are not otherwise preserved. The baiting, for example, of Sir Fretful Plagiary by Sneer and Dangle is elaborated as follows:

Dangle: O, It's only to be laugh'd at—for—certainly what Sir Fretful observes is Extreemly true, an Author of Eminence who is a Candidate for fame ought to distrust —

Sir Fret: It wasn't in the Morning Post, I do sometimes see that.

Dangle: No, I think not — I say he ought to distrust his own Merit; if it doesn't Create Envy Sufficient —

Sir Fret: Not the Morning Chronicle — I happen'd to have met with that lately —

Dangle: No, I'm sure not — Envy Sufficient I say, to procure him the Sanction of abuse from bad writers.

Sir Fret: The Gazetteer —

¹ *Sheridan's Plays as He Wrote Them* (1902).

Dangle : I really didn't take notice, as I knew you only laugh'd at these Things — therefore Mr. Sneer, a Man of Sense —
Sir Fret : You don't happen to recollect what the fellow said, do you ?

The review of *The Critic* in *The Lady's Magazine* has a reference to the "many alterations made by Mr. Sheridan to obviate some objections made the first night," and it may be presumed that this passage was among those excised.

The prompt-book now at Harvard was prepared in 1782, although it was certainly also used for later revivals. It is an emended copy of the first edition of 1781, and it contains, with the prompter's paraphernalia, a number of additions and omissions for which Sheridan may or may not have been responsible. A point of interest is that the "puff direct" of de Louthembourg (who had dissociated himself from Drury Lane in 1781) was replaced by the following passage :

In short, we have on this occasion to regret that the decorum of our Religion makes it impossible to perform this Piece more than *Six* nights in the Week, though we haven't the smallest doubt that if the Performers could be prevailed on to undergo the fatigue it wou'd be infinite recomodation to the Town to have this exhibition *twice* in the Day thro' the remainder of the Season.

Thomas Dibdin remarks in the preface to his edition of *The Critic* (1814), "The supposed extracts from newspapers, names of, and compliments to particular performers, with other temporary or local passages occurring in this excellent afterpiece, have been always varied to suit the times and circumstances of current representation" ; and the principle explains the remarkable way in which Puff's topical allusions at the end of the first act were brought up to date in the prompt-book :

Here is a *Patriotic Grocer*, & a *Seaman's Letter to a Tea-Man* — both on the Commutation Act and promised for Tomorrow ! ay & I have promised & been paid for too, a *Pindaric Ode to Mr. Twining* by Kit Congo ; with notes Critical & Historical by *Bobby Bohea* — pretty breakfast reading & must be ready for Thursday. — Here too are some Political Memorandums I see — Aye — to put the Emperor's Army in Motion while the Frost lasts, & kill the King of Prussia as soon as it thaws. — So ! — India matters too — Quere, why not make the Great Mogul an Irish Peer, and put the Management of the East into the hands of the Commissioners of the Lottery ? — Zounds ! this is a long business — I must reserve it for the Evening Papers — for I know that I have undertaken Tomorrow besides to establish the Authority of the High Bailiff

in the Morning Post, & maintain the rapid progress of the Scrutiny in the Public Advertiser — So, egad, I ha'n't a Moment to lose.

The prompter's notes are occasionally interesting. There is an elaborate description of the "scenic display" at the end of the play and the mimic representation of the Spanish Armada :

Whistle & Ring above & below. — A Few Bars of "To Arms" — to shew Scene, then "Britons strike home" — during which the Fleet Fire — 1st. Fire Ship P.S. Sails to 1st. Spanish Ship O.P. and sinks her. 2nd. Fire Ship Sails to Mid : Spanish Ship She Blows up, after which Spanish Fleet Retreat, and British Fleet advance.

The Armada was followed by a grand procession to "Handel's Water Musick," consisting of a "Swan," a "Fish," ten tributaries of the Thames, "The band," the Thames himself in a triumphal car drawn by four boys with a "Bank" on each side, and a "Rod" and "Net."

The edition of *The Critic* in *Cumberland's British Theatre* (1827) can be identified, by some of the "gags," as the version acted at Covent Garden on December 15, 1826. Its interest is its date and its connection with the Larpent manuscript and the Drury Lane prompt-book. It is noteworthy that the three versions were all acting versions, the prompt-book being a revision of the Larpent text, and the Cumberland edition of the prompt-book, and that they agree in differing from the standard text of Becket's editions. I am quoting only three of these differences, but the list could be extended, and there are a number of passages, in addition, in the Becket text which are not in any of the acting versions :

- i. 1. That is to unite poetry & Justice indeed.

[BECKET : It is truly moral.]

- ii. 2. When briefly all I hear or see bears stamp
Of martial preparation.

[BECKET : martial vigilance.]

- ii. 2. While the Spanish Admiral's chief hope,
His darling son —

[BECKET : Iberian Admiral's.]

What is the significance of the differences ? It seems to me to be the disconcerting conclusion that the accepted text of *The Critic*, which was authorized by Sheridan himself, was not in use on the stage at any time in his lifetime. I can see no alternative. The

fact must be faced, with all its potential complications, that Sheridan was capable of drawing a distinction between the acting and the reading versions of his plays.

F. W. BATESON.

JOHNSON'S LETTER TO TAYLOR

I LAST reported progress in *R.E.S.* 57 (Jan. 1939), p. 81. Lot 638 in Sotheby's sale of March 20, 1940, is Johnson to Taylor of March 9, 1779. Mr. Hobson very kindly informs me that it bears Taylor's endorsement and is numbered by him 56. This further narrows the gap between 53 and 59. It seems probable that all the missing letters (the number of which is approximately fixed by Taylor's careful numeration of them) are in the hands of collectors. More than a dozen are still untraced.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

REVIEWS

Anglo-Saxon Charters. Edited with Translation and Notes by
A. J. ROBERTSON. London: Cambridge University Press,
1939. Pp. xxxviii+555. 25s. net.

ALFRED THE GREAT, in his preface to his *Blostman*, compares the *Soliloquies of St. Augustine* to a forest from which, "for each of the works that he would work, he chose the fairest trees, as far as he could carry them away. Never did he bring any burden home without longing to bring home the whole wood, for in every tree he saw something of which he had need." Dr. Robertson's selected forest is Anglo-Saxon charters, and she has surpassed Alfred and aimed at including every kind of deed and record concerned with the transaction of legal business, her only exceptions being those already edited in F. E. Harmer's *Select English Historical Documents* and D. Whitelock's *Anglo-Saxon Wills*. The product of this eclectic taste is a collection of one hundred and thirty-five charters dealing with an immense variety of affairs. More than half, however, are concerned with the conveyance of land. Besides thirty-two leases, there are twenty-seven grants of land (mostly made by devout folk endowing monasteries), four exchanges of estates, and three money sales—sixty-nine land charters in all. Twelve business agreements form the next most numerous group, and there are nine royal charters conferring freedom from dues and other privileges on various abbeys. The remaining forty-five include six lists of books and other treasures, five wills, five accounts of law-suits, four histories of estates, four deeds concerning the payment or remission of dues, four accounts of gifts and endowments, two marriage agreements, two lists of sureties of estates, and two special bequests, but the other sixteen defy classification. Their titles vary from that tenth-century thriller "The Crimes and Forfeitures of Wulfbold" (LXIII) to the humdrum "Grant of a Swine Pasture in Kent" (LXXV), from the Burghal Hidage (App. II, 1) to the "List of Contributions of Men required for Manning a Ship" (LXXII).

The book is published by the Cambridge University Press in

their Studies of English Legal History, so it is probable that its principal readers will be specialists in early English law. They will find the "History of the Estates of Sunbury and Send" (XLIV) particularly interesting, with its vivid account of the retribution that fell on Aethelstan of Sunbury when he failed to appear at a trial after being "vouched to warranty" for the defendant. Dr. Robertson might well have given a more adequate note on this process instead of merely referring to her own notes in the *Laws of the Kings of England from Edmund to Henry I.* Not everyone has got perfect facilities for consulting reference books, and it is always tiresome, when interested in a subject, to have to look it up in another book before one can make sense of what one is reading. Fuller notes would likewise be useful on the "divided hide" (see p. 335) and the "partible meadow" (p. 363). Leases of land for so many lifetimes, the gradual substitution of money rents for rents in kind, and the duplication and triplication of documents as security for property are noticeable legal features of these charters. The importance of the oath is well brought out in the "Lawsuit about Wood Pasture" (V), in the "History of the Estate of Wouldham in Kent" (XLI), and in the "Record of a Lawsuit between Wynflaed and Leofwine" (LXVI). When Leofwine claimed the manors of Hagbourne and Bradfield from Wynflaed, the lady was told she might prove her ownership of her estates before a meeting of all Berkshire. She had twenty-four named supporters "besides many a good thegn and good woman, all of whom we cannot enumerate. Then the councillors who were there declared that it would be better for the oath to be dispensed with rather than sworn, because thereafter friendship would be at an end between them." The "witan" on this occasion seem to have been very wise men indeed, for Wynflaed produced as little of her father's gold as she dared to protect her oath. "Leofwine was still not satisfied with it, unless she should swear that all his property was there. She said that she could not do so for her part nor he for his." (!) Obviously both parties would have had to swear unjustly to acquire all they claimed, and terribly bad feeling would have been left behind. The Archbishop of Canterbury's oath, on the other hand, was accepted without demur as proof of the verbal will by which Aelfheah left six ploughlands at Wouldham to St. Andrew's, Rochester (XLI).

Historians will find a mine of information in these documents, and the author's learned and exceedingly numerous notes identify-

ing the various signatories will fill them with admiration almost amounting to awe. The mass of erudition contained in these notes is simply astounding, but of course their interest varies enormously. One cannot imagine anybody caring very much about the more obscure thegns, priests, and monks who signed the many monastic leases, but many of the notes and identifications are really excellent and stimulating. It is astonishing the way a list of mere names, in the light of Dr. Robertson's learning, turns into an assembly of real people. Where all are careful and scholarly it is hard to select any notes for special praise, but those on Abbot Aelfhun (LXIX), Aethelmaer (LXX), Wynsige (LV), Alfred (XV), and Osgoth (XCVIII) are particularly good. In the texts the historian will be interested to find confirmation of certain events mentioned in other sources. Such are the expulsion of the priests from Winchester by Aethelwold (XXXVIII) and the endowment of Ely by Edgar (XLVIII), but, considering the stirring times, it is disappointing that so little political history is contained in these documents. There is far more social history, and much light is thrown on the status of churls and peasants. To the ignorant it is a shock to learn that there were slaves in Anglo-Saxon England. Not only were they handed over to a new landowner as part of the stock of an estate (see Nos. XXI, XXXIX, LXXVII, and LXXIX), but the actual price paid for them is recorded (App. 2 IX), a man fetching five ores (about 100 pence) and a certain woman the same sum. In the same chapter we read: "Eighty swine and the swineherd were transferred from Milton: the swine were valued at one and a half pounds and the swineherd at half a pound." The survey of the Manor of Tidenham (CIV) distinguishes between the services required from a *geneat* and a *gebur*: "The *geneat* must labour either on the estate or off the estate, whichever he is bidden, and ride and furnish carrying service and supply transport and drive herds and do many other things." The *gebur* had to do what was due from him, and his duties included ploughing half an acre a week, "supplying timber, reaping, mowing, and work of other kinds." Certainly in those days a tenant farmer had a very hard life indeed.

The list of estates liable for work on Rochester Bridge (LII) is of interest to the study of the history of architecture, and naval historians will appreciate the little-known "List of the Contributions of Men required for Manning a Ship" (LXXII).

A collection of documents of known place and date is naturally

a delight to the dialect specialist. Students of Anglo-Saxon boundaries, on the other hand, may be rather disappointed by the notes in this book. Grundy's excellent identifications have been used and the place-names carefully worked out, but there is no trace of any original exploration on the author's part. Only by walking or riding round the bounds of an estate can the first-hand knowledge be acquired without which nobody can write about them with either interest or conviction. Dr. Robertson sees her boundaries as Milton saw Nature—"through the spectacles of books."

Considering that these charters are a collection of business documents, it is a pleasant surprise to find how much they contain of human interest, extraordinarily stimulating to the imagination. One would dearly like to know what Wulfstan thought and said when his aunt Ceolwin left fifteen hides of land at Alton to the Old Minster at Winchester on condition that they remembered the souls of her and her husband, and in the same document arranged that he, Wulfstan, her own brother's son, should have *one* hide of land rent free as long as he lived (XVII). What a wonderful amount of family jealousy and hypocrisy must have arisen when Alderman Wulfgar announced that he would verbally bequeath his estate at Craft "to such of my young kinsmen as obey me best" (XXVI)! Good comradeship between mother and son was perhaps carried too far when they combined to stick an iron pin into an image of one Alfsige, "and the deadly image was dragged out of her room. Then the woman was taken out and drowned at London Bridge, but her son escaped and became an outlaw" (XXXVII). Was Walnoth the Painter an extravagant Bohemian artist obliged to sell the family estate at Oxney, or was he merely a skilled craftsman who had invested his savings in land (XL)? Quite shocking dishonesty seems to have gone on after the death of the rich old Kentish bachelor Aelfheah. The husband of his nephew's childless widow seized his estates, contrary to the old man's verbal will, which bequeathed them to Rochester, and it took the oath of the Archbishop of Canterbury himself to get possession of them for the community (XLIV).

The troubles of the Sunbury estate began (like so much in life) with a woman. She was stolen, and Aethelstan of Sunbury was "vouched to warranty" by the thief. He stupidly let the suit go by default, and was consequently fined his wergeld, but had no money with which to pay it. His brother Edward, who already possessed the title-deeds of Aethelstan's estate at Sunbury, offered

to pay the fine in exchange for possession of the land. "Then Aethelstan said that he would rather it perished by fire or flood than suffer that. Then Edward said: 'It would be worse for neither of us to have it.' But that was what happened," and although, in the new king's reign, Edward again offered to pay the wergeld, Aethelstan still would not allow him to do so and the estate was forfeited to the Crown. Here is the stuff of which tragedy is made. Edward's desire for the ancestral acres overcomes his natural duty freely to help his brother, and Aethelstan's jealousy of the prosperous Edward makes him refuse to let him have the beloved estate, although it will otherwise pass away from the family for ever.

"A Herefordshire Lawsuit" (LXXVIII) deals with another family disagreement. This is the most dramatic document in the whole collection. "Edwin, Enneaw's son, came travelling to the meeting and sued his own mother for a certain piece of land, namely Wellington and Cradley. Then the Bishop asked whose business it was to answer for his mother, and Thurkil the White replied that it was his business to do so, if he knew the claim. As he did not know the claim, three thegns were chosen from the meeting to ride to the place where she was—namely Fawley—and these were Leofwine of Frome and Aethelsige the Red and Winsige the seaman, and when they came to her they asked her what claim she had to the lands for which her son was suing her. Then she said that she had no land in any way that belonged to him, and was strongly incensed against her son, and summoned to her her kinswoman, Leofflaed, Thurkil's wife, and in front of them said to her as follows: 'Here sits Leofflaed, my kinswoman, to whom, after my death, I grant my land and my gold, my clothing and my raiment and all that I possess.' And then she said to the thegns: 'Act like thegns, and duly announce my message to the meeting before all the worthy men, and tell them to whom I have granted all my land and property, and not a thing to my own son, and ask them to be witnesses of this.'"

Library catalogues of the past always have a certain fascination for the bibliophile. Four of the miscellaneous undated documents in the second appendix of this book are book lists, and there is another in a Bury St. Edmunds charter (CIV). The titles of twenty-one religious books, which Bishop Aethelwold gave to Peterborough at its restoration in A.D. 963, are given in charter XXXIX, and the famous gifts of Bishop Leofric to Exeter included a library of over sixty volumes, where previously the minster had had only "one

capitulary, one worn-out nocturnale and one epistle book and two very poor worn-out lectionaries (App. I, 1)."

Since the subject-matter of Dr. Robertson's book is of such great value and interest to so many classes of scholars, it is a great pity that her preface is so short and inadequate. The charters need her expert guidance, so that each specialist may be able to investigate his own subject without having to wade through a lot of material which does not interest him. The excellent "Indices Nominum, Locorum et Rerum" help to fill this want, but hunting through an index for words that suggest a connection with one's own subject is a dull way of being introduced to a book. Doctor Hazeltine's *Anglo-Saxon Documents as Evidence of Legal History*, promised as an introduction to these charters, will partly fill the present gaping void, but it will specialize on their legal aspect. It would be far better if an adequate general introduction were bound up with the texts.

All Dr. Robertson's charters had previously been printed except the Thorney Abbey Assignments (App. II, 9). Nevertheless her re-editing of the material will be of inestimable value to scholars. In the first place, it is all conveniently assembled in one compact volume complete with an excellent translation. A hundred and eleven of the charters are scattered at wide intervals through the mighty tomes of Kemble and Birch, but the remainder have to be sought among quarterlies, manuscript catalogues, etc. The latter have generally been carefully edited on modern methods, but neither Kemble nor Birch provides Dr. Robertson's accurate texts. She has investigated all the available manuscripts of each charter, and her text often derives from a far better source than was available to those older scholars. The principal manuscripts drawn upon are the following:

Manuscript.	Catalogue reference.	Number of charters derived from it.
Hemming's Cartulary ..	B. Mus. Cotton Tib. AXIII	18
Codex Wintoniensis ..	B. Mus. Addit. MS. 15350	15
Peterborough Cartulary ..	Soc. of Antiquities, London MS. 60.	6
Textus Roffensis ..	Rochester.	5
Sherborne Cartulary ..	Mr. Fenwick's Collection at Cheltenham.	5
Sacrist's Register of the Abbey of Bury St. Edmunds.	Camb. Univ. Lib. FF. 2.33	5
Liber Monasterii de Hyda ..	Lord Macclesfield's Library at Sherborne Castle, Watlington.	4
Worcester Cartulary ..	B. Mus. Harley 4660.	4

Besides these great monastic cartularies, thirty-eight MSS. have been drawn upon for one or two charters, Hickes's *Thesaurus* is the source of five, and Smith's edition of Bede of three. It is noteworthy that twenty-four documents have survived in contemporary single parchments. Thirteen of these are chirographs, which proves that they are the actual originals of the deeds, and most probably the other eleven are likewise originals. The examination of so many manuscripts must have been a Herculean task, for which scholars cannot be sufficiently grateful to Dr. Robertson.

Gratitude, indeed, is the note on which this review must end. As Dr. Hazeltine says in his foreword: "By her provision of an accurate and reliable text of many vernacular documents and by the wealth of information which she has embodied in her many notes on these documents, Miss Robertson has materially advanced the historical study of pre-Norman times." Honest scholarly work like hers is worthy of the glorious motto at the entrance to the Bodleian Library: "Plurimi pertransibunt et multiplex erit scientia," and many will pass joyfully through the covers of this book to a greater knowledge of the long-ignored early history of their motherland.

J. M. K.-Y.

Wessex and Old English Poetry, with special Consideration of "The Ruin." By CECILIA A. HOTCHNER. New York (privately published). 1939. Pp. vi+146. (No price.)

THE view that almost all early Old English poetry was originally composed in Northumbria has so permeated the text-books that the slenderness of the evidence for it is often forgotten. The well-known cultural and literary traditions of early Northumbria have led too readily to the assumption that it was the centre of poetic production, and the texts, surviving usually with a heavy West Saxon overlay, have commonly been assigned a place of origin very far from Wessex. Dr. Hotchner shares the growing feeling that this is an unwarranted assumption, and she attempts to develop another theory. She begins by giving a brief survey of the culture of southern England in the seventh and eighth centuries, a culture, she argues, which must have been favourable to the composition and cherishing of vernacular poetry. Then she considers *The Ruin* in particular, presenting detailed arguments in favour of the generally accepted belief that it refers to Bath, and dealing trenchantly with the recent

theory of Professor S. J. Herben¹ that it refers to Hadrian's Wall. Concluding that the poem almost certainly describes Bath, Dr. Hotchner infers (and here the argument is weak) that the author belonged to the "southwestern part of England." She then proceeds to consider some other poems which have affinities of style and language with *The Ruin*, such as *The Wanderer*, *The Seafarer*, and the *Cottonian Gnostic Verses*; these, she suggests, may well belong to the south of England also. The text of *The Ruin* is printed, and a translation is given: the handling here is not very critical, and some of the grounds for localization depend upon doubtful emendations and interpretations; these, however, do not invalidate the general argument in favour of Bath. In an appendix Dr. Hotchner considers the possible influence of the *De Excidio Thoringie* of Venantius Fortunatus upon *The Wanderer* and *The Ruin*. Earlier in the book, in a section which might perhaps have better formed an appendix, she discusses the *Exeter Book* and suggests tentatively that it was written at Glastonbury: the theory, which is not altogether new in England, is an attractive one, and merits further investigation.

Dr. Hotchner believes, on very slender evidence indeed, that *The Ruin* was composed in the second quarter of the eighth century;² furthermore, that it is essentially a "Wessex" poem, and that the non-West Saxon forms (which she shares out rather uncertainly between Kent and Mercia) are to be expected at a time when Kent was culturally influential and when Wessex and Mercia were struggling for supremacy in the south-west. The whole work surveys very difficult ground, and though the part of the book which deals with *The Ruin* and its reference to Bath is interestingly worked out, it cannot be said that in dealing with the more general problem of "Wessex Poetry" Dr. Hotchner has sifted the evidence with sufficient care. Her treatment of linguistic problems is weak, and she attempts no preliminary survey of the language and history of Wessex in the eighth century. She does, indeed, consider some of the dialect forms in the text, and shows that the "Kentish, or less plausibly, Mercian" features are few in number. But from this she infers that *The Ruin* is fundamentally West Saxon,

¹ *Modern Language Notes*, vol. LIV, p. 37.

² She suggests, in fact, a date, 725-30, merely because she assumes that the city was laid waste after the battle of Deorham in 577, "and, as the archaeologists maintain, it took about one hundred and fifty years for the city to fall into the condition described in the poem." The style and vocabulary suggest an early date of composition, but the attempt at such precise dating on the archaeological evidence is unfortunate and misleading.

and that the aberrant forms are due to influence from without. In fact, they are probably all Mercian, and it is likely that we are facing not the chance influence of a Kentish scribe or odd Mercian intrusions due to political contacts, but rather the presence of a basic Mercian element. The rarity of these forms is irrelevant: the fact that they occur at all in a southern manuscript of the late tenth century suggests that here, as in other poems, they were once more numerous. It is true that almost nothing is known about West Saxon of the eighth century, that even as late as Alfred this dialect was not fully standardized, and that it is therefore possible that sub-dialects within West Saxon territory whose characteristics were later eradicated might have had in the eighth century all the linguistic forms which *The Ruin* presents.¹ It is more reasonable, however, to seek to ascribe these forms to a dialect where there is definite evidence for their existence: the language of *The Ruin* suggests that it is an originally Mercian² poem which in its extant state is disguised in a predominantly West Saxon dress. This need not invalidate the author's contention that the poem was composed in the south-west; the territory of the Hwicce is a plausible place of composition. Dr. Hotchner mentions the Hwicce in passing, but she gives no consideration to the political and cultural importance of Mercia in the eighth century, and seems to assume that a poem composed at that date near Bath would automatically be a "Wessex" poem.³ Whatever tribal groups may have existed within the territory of the Hwicce, it is certain that in the eighth century the control there and the culture were primarily Mercian.⁴ If, as seems plausible (though it is fallacious to assume this on the grounds of the subject),

¹ On the existence of dialects within West Saxon cf. C. L. Wrenn, "Standard Old English," *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 1933, p. 65 ff. With Dr. Hotchner's claims for a West Saxon origin one may compare the much more cautious suggestions advanced regarding *Deor* by Professor Kemp Malone in his edition of the poem in Methuen's *Old English Library*.

² Dr. Hotchner herself compares *undereotone* and *forweorone* to forms in the *Corpus Glossary*, though she does not draw this conclusion.

³ As Dr. Hotchner notices, it was Offa of Mercia who in 775 made a grant for the construction of a church in Bath itself.

⁴ Cf. Wolfgang Keller, "Die literarischen Bestrebungen von Worcester in Angelsächsischer Zeit," *Quellen und Forschungen*, 1900. He reverts to the topic in "Angelsächsische Palaeographie," *Palästra*, XLIII, 1906, p. 20ff. On the numerous monastic foundations in the territory of the Hwicce in the eighth century see Stubbs, *Archaeological Journal*, 19, p. 252. It is worth noting that the early kings of the Hwicce seem to have a connection with the Bernician dynasty (see R. H. Hodgkin, *History of the Anglo-Saxons* p. 192): this would explain the existence there (if it needs explanation) of a poetical tradition which is usually associated with the North. On the tribal elements within the territory of the

the poem was composed somewhere in the territory of the Hwicce, it would almost certainly be in a Mercian dialect, and owe nothing whatever to Wessex except its later preservation there. It is just as probable that it was composed rather farther north, deeper in Mercian territory, in which case there could be no question as to the original dialect. Dr. Hotchner's sketchy account of culture in early Wessex does nothing to prove the existence of a school of poetry there or to offset the literary importance of the western monasteries which formed an important group even before the patronage of Offa and his successor Cænwulf. Thus both on linguistic and historical grounds the arguments put forth by Dr. Hotchner are somewhat unsatisfactory, and if she has done the service of reopening a crucial problem in Old English literature,¹ her study can only be regarded as a starting-point for a much more thorough and comprehensive investigation.

ANGUS MCINTOSH.

A Map of Old English Monasteries and Related Ecclesiastical Foundations A.D. 400-1066. By ALICE M. RYAN. (Cornell Studies in English, XXVIII.) Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1939. Pp. vi + 33. 1 Map. 4s. 6d. net.

MISS RYAN'S *Map of Old English Monasteries* comes as a timely complement to the *Map of Britain in the Dark Ages* issued by the Ordnance Survey in 1935. Her map of *Anglia Monastica* before the Norman Conquest if not without weak points will all the same prove a very useful instrument to both the political and the ecclesiastical historian as well as to the student of English Topography and Place Names.

Miss Ryan has been quite broad in her conception of Monastic England: besides monasteries her map includes monastic cells, hermitages, episcopal sees, minsters, and even crosses: in short, a wealth of detail concerning the material manifestations of the early English Church. It must, however, be noticed with some

Hwicce see A. Mawer, and F. M. Stenton, *The Place-names of Worcestershire*, p. xvi. Cf. R. G. Collingwood and J. N. L. Myers, *Roman Britain and the English Settlements*, p. 409, and Hodgkin, *loc. cit.*

¹ As late as 1935, Miss E. E. Wardale could write without hesitation (in *Chapters on Old English Literature*, p. 57) that *The Ruin* "is written in the Northumbrian dialect." There is no ground whatever for this statement.

regret that the results of her labours have to some extent been spoilt by weaknesses in method, weaknesses which in some cases reach almost carelessness. Such shortcomings appear both on the map and in the booklet which accompanies it. Starting with the actual map, it would doubtless have been more satisfactory if the approximate boundaries of the various Bishoprics of Anglo-Saxon England had been given. Similarly, in as far as the various place-names given in the map are concerned, it would have been more sensible to give the modern current forms and reserve Latin and Anglo-Saxon forms for the index. As it stands the map offers a mixture of Latin and Anglo-Saxon names which is truly bewildering. Moreover, it seems extravagant to see places like London, Canterbury, or Oxford given as *Lundenwic*, *Cantwaraburg*, and *Oxenaford*.

The inclusion of some Welsh and Scottish monasteries seems at least quite arbitrary, especially when most of them can hardly be described as "related ecclesiastical foundations." Either Miss Ryan should have given us all the Welsh and Scottish monastic institutions and called her work *A Map of Old British Monasteries*, or she should have only included those foundations which were connected with English ones.

The Introduction, Index, and Bibliography are also open to criticism. The introduction includes sweeping statements such as "the later date (1066) marks the introduction of a Norman culture which effected absolute changes in the ecclesiastical architecture and organization that had developed during the preceeding six centuries," or "names compounded with *lan* indicate a monastery." Actually *lan* (or *llan* < **landa*) means enclosure and was included in Welsh place names to indicate the enclosure of a church named after a saint and, though also, not necessarily a monastery. Hermitages are referred to by the author as an extraordinary form of monasticism (p. 4). This is no doubt a startling remark when we consider that the hermits constituted one of the earliest forms of monastic life both in the East and in the West.

The Index could have been compiled with greater care. A more thorough proof reading could have avoided several misprints (cf. for instance Schrewsbury for Shrewsbury at p. 24), while the various place-names could have been given under their modern form, Latin and Anglo-Saxon forms following according to the practice of the publications of the *English Place Name Society*. Moreover, in some cases, as for instance with the entries on London or Canterbury,

other forms besides some rather unusual ones might have been provided. It is rather startling to see the names given to London before 1066 being limited to *Ludenwic* and *Civitas Ludensis*.

The main impression given by the bibliography is something near to chaos: some publications are mentioned in it more than once; some authors are given their Christian names in full, others are instead given only their initials; some of the works in it are dated, others are not, although their date is quite well known. Yet, despite technical weaknesses, Miss Ryan has produced a most useful piece of research. But it would be advisable that the second edition of it, which she promises us, should be thoroughly revised.

R. WEISS.

Early Middle English Literature. By R. M. WILSON.
(Methuen's *Old English Library*.) London: Methuen & Co.,
Ltd. 1939. Pp. x+309. 8s. 6d. net.

IN this book Mr. Wilson has undertaken the difficult task of surveying the literature of England from the Norman Conquest to the year 1300. The endless problems of the period are well known and are the despair of all but the specialist: the affinities and origins of most of the literary forms are difficult to trace, the texts are often hard to date and localize with precision, and their language, usually mishandled by scribes, is not always easy to interpret. Much has been lost altogether and what remains is not likely to have been the best and can hardly be even representative. Mr. Wilson has outlined the problems and incorporated many of the recent conclusions about them: he has surveyed the main literary types, French and Latin as well as English, and the result is a valuable handbook for the student and the general reader. What is omitted or included must therefore be judged on that basis, for the book makes no pretence of being particularly advanced or particularly original.¹ Sometimes the author vacillates between assuming too much and too little knowledge on the part of the reader. For example, the "kenning" is mentioned familiarly on p. 16, and then defined (rather surreptitiously, in the middle of a sentence) on p. 208. The word "mediæval" is used several times (e.g. pp. 197, 204, 221) in a rather vague manner which might confuse anyone who

¹ Though, of course, it includes the results of the valuable work done by the author himself in *Leeds Studies in English*, vols. II and V.

had to be told what a "kenning" was; and for those wishing to refer to recent articles on various relevant topics the citations are not always quite adequate.

Of the various sections of the book some are much more penetrating and valuable than others. The chapter on the lyric might have been fuller and weightier: the author has been very cautious in his views and recent suggestions and theories find little place there. The chapter on the continuity of the homiletic tradition rightly gives clear expression to the views which Professor R. W. Chambers first set out in detail. Yet now that the cult of Continuity has grown so powerful is it not time to probe more closely the innovations? Such works as the *Ancren Riwele* do not owe everything in their style to Old English homiletic prose and now there seems almost to be a danger of assuming that, and not examining further. Mr. Wilson has also discussed fully and with authority the significance of the literature that has been lost, a matter of the highest importance for the understanding of this period. He has dealt systematically with almost all the main works and localized and dated these as closely as our present knowledge allows. Rightly or wrongly, he has disregarded almost all texts which do not exist in manuscripts which were written before 1300. As a result, a period already sparsely represented is denied some of its masterpieces. The lyrics of MS. Harley 2253 are neglected and the beginnings of the great era of Northern literature are left without more than a word. The precise dating of such works as the *Cursor Mundi*, the *Surtees Psalter*, and the *Northern Homily Cycle* is a difficult matter, but these are not likely to be later than 1300, and so some account might reasonably have been expected of the beginnings of that extraordinary literary movement in the north which had so many representatives in the following century. Moreover, several texts are stated without question to belong to the fourteenth century which may well be rather earlier, e.g. *Sir Tristrem*¹ and *King Alisaunder*. The *King Alisaunder* group deserves a place in the chapter on Romance. Beside such over-definite statements about dates, the author has occasional excesses of caution, as in this unnecessarily indeterminate remark about *King Horn*:

The original dialect, as far as it can be deduced from the rhymes, seems to have shown south-eastern influence, and it is possible that the

¹ If Thomas of Erceledoune wrote it (as stated without hesitation on p. 215), *Sir Tristrem* must belong to the late thirteenth century.

poem may have been composed somewhere in the southern part of the East Midland dialectal area.

The style and the arrangement of the book are not always satisfactory; there are numerous repetitions of fact and phrase, frequent awkward shifts of tense, and occasional unpleasant words like "synthesization." The literary historian has obligations in these matters as well as in exactitude, and if more attention had been paid to them the special merits of this volume would have stood out to better advantage.

ANGUS MCINTOSH.

The Arthurian Legend. Comparison of Treatment in Modern and Mediæval Literature. A Study in the Literary Value of Myth and Legend. By MARGARET J. C. REID. Edinburgh and London: Oliver & Boyd, Ltd. 1938. Pp. viii + 277. 15s. net.

To the many odd books on this subject Miss Reid has added one whose main redeeming feature is that it can do no real harm. The book is obviously a beginner's thesis, not a work of research, and its faults are due partly to lack of proper guidance and only partly to the author's own limitations. Of these she is blissfully unaware. She sets out to produce some "connected literary criticism on the modern poets who have used as subject-matter the traditional material of the Arthurian legend" and to apply the "*logical and philosophical method of criticism*," but it never occurs to her that she has no command of any such method, or that her work, far from being a scholarly treatise on the evolution of Arthurian romance, is but an incomplete and often inaccurate account of well-known facts and doctrines. The inaccuracies would be tedious to enumerate. Miss Reid mentions "the anonymous twelfth-century *Queste*, the actual manuscript of which is lost." There never was a "twelfth-century *Queste*": the earliest *Queste del Saint Graal* belongs to the second quarter of the thirteenth century and is preserved in numerous manuscripts, although it is true that the manuscript used by Malory for his compilation is no longer extant. "In regard to the general origins of the Grail," says Miss Reid, "scholars mainly agree that the foundation of the story lies in the far-off region of pagan myth." Scholars do *not* agree on this point, and the latest studies on the subject have, if anything, strengthened the belief in the Christian

origins of the legend. Nor is Miss Reid better informed about the *Tristan* story. "Its roots," she declares, "as modern researches prove, are to be found in Celtic mythology" (p. 181). Modern researches, in so far as they prove anything at all, point in the opposite direction.

Whenever Miss Reid ventures some original remark she makes all critical comment unnecessary. One example will suffice. Bérout's version of the *Tristan* legend contains the well-known adaptation of the story of Midas: Mark has horse's ears, the dwarf alone knows his secret and reveals it to the thornbush, knowing that the King's barons are listening. In Miss Reid's view, however, there is more in it than meets the eye: the episode, she claims,

points to the fact that the tale of *Tristan* at one time belonged to a group of transformation myths when men were changed into animals and vice versa. This may go still further back, to a time when men worshipped gods in the form of animals. A modern recension of such a tale, which caused considerable interest on its appearance, is David Garnett's *Lady into Fox*.

This may serve as a classical example of what *Quellenforschung* can become in unskilled hands, but here is something which any reader with a minimum of taste will resent even more: "Malory's style," says Miss Reid, "*like the sauce of a good cook* makes this strange mixture palatable." A metaphor such as this makes one wonder whether the author is capable of "distinguishing the true metal from the false," as she admittedly intends to do, and assessing the æsthetic values of Malory, of Spenser, and of Wagner.

Miss Reid's erudition is vast and her bibliography (pp. 264-9) might be of use even to the specialists; but she has read perhaps too much for her purpose. For had she known less about such things as the doctrine of reincarnation she might have refrained from saying, as she does, that *Tristan's* remark about his destiny (in Wagner)—"It was I myself that made it"—refers to his former existence.

E. V.

Iranian and Indian Analogues of the Legend of the Holy Grail. By Sir J. C. COYAJEE, Bombay: D. B. Taraporevala Sons & Co. 1939. Pp. viii + 90. R. 1-8.

THE object of this book is to show that the explanation of the Grail cult can be found in Iranian traditions which were carried to the

West through the agency of Mithraic mysteries. The Grail itself is identified with the Royal Glory (*Hvarenō*), the quest of which is the main topic of the legend of *Shāhnāme*h; the Grail lance is the magic lance of King Kai Khusrau; and the Fisher King is either *Afrāsiyab*, as he appears in the *Zamyād Yasht*, or Kai Kaus, the grandfather of King Kai Khusrau. The story of Perceval, which Sir J. C. Coyajee describes as "the Great Fool Tale," is compared with that of the boyhood of Kai Khusrau, who "saves his life by pretending idiocy"; and there are "analogues" of a similar type to the "Vengeance Quest" and the Grail Castle.

We are not in a position to judge this theory in its entirety, for we claim no knowledge of the Iranian and Indian literature to which it refers. But we may perhaps venture a few remarks based on the study of the Arthurian texts. With these Sir J. C. Coyajee shows unfortunately no first-hand acquaintance. No mediævalist would support his statement (p. 6) that the Arthurian legend has "for its main topic" the quest of the Grail, or that "the basic ideas of the Round Table of Arthur were those of *purity* and *knightly celibacy*." Nor would any Arthurian scholar agree with the identification of the Perceval story with that of a "pseudo-idiot." What Sir J. C. Coyajee seems to work upon is not the Arthurian legend as it really is, but the theories propounded by a particular group of scholars such as Miss Jessie L. Weston, Alfred Nutt, and Professor R. S. Loomis. A few examples will suffice to illustrate this fundamental error of method. Once we admit that the Grail story is a "Vengeance Quest," there is every reason to look for analogues in the East, this "land of vendettas." But the Grail legend never was a "Vengeance Quest" except in the imagination of certain critics. Sir J. C. Coyajee is so completely unaware of the real character of the legend that he quotes as a parallel to it a passage from the *Zamyād Yasht* about the "Kingly Glory" which "*might extinguish all the non-Aryan nations*" (p. 8). The nearest approach to this in European literature is not the *Quest of the Holy Grail*, but *Mein Kampf*. The same may be said of the worshipper of *Vere-thraghna* (the Genius of Victory), who prays *Yazata* that he may be "constantly victorious as any one of all the Aryans, that he may cut into pieces this army that is coming behind him." The fact that such a passage as this can be seriously quoted as an "analogue" to the Grail story only shows the inherent fallacy of the doctrine which Sir J. C. Coyajee uses as a premiss of his own theory. And it is

pathetic to see his great learning wasted on the discovery of further "analogues" to "Merlin the sun-god" who only exists in such works as Professor R. S. Loomis's *Celtic Myth and Arthurian Romance*. Sir J. C. Coyajee's remarks about the Grail lance are based on the same authority and suffer from the same weakness. The fact that the hero is "given a sword at the outset of his career" is part of the ordinary routine of mediæval chivalry and requires no mythological explanation; but once we depart from reality and accept Prof. Loomis's plea for the Irish origins of the story we have no reason to object to Sir J. C. Coyajee's attempt to trace it still further back and connect it with the legend of King Kai Khusrau, whose magic lance, once thrust into the wall of the enchanted castle of Bahman, breaks the spell and disperses the demons.

"The Grail student," he says in conclusion, "has already gone far afield to all lands which received and cultivated the *Matière de Bretagne*. . . . He has to go even further and to study the forms which the cult of the Grail or Glory has assumed in older Aryan systems of thought" (p. 89). But surely, before going "even further," any conscientious "Grail student" should ascertain whether by taking so much for granted he has not already gone too far.

E. V.

Three Middle English Sermons from the Worcester Chapter MS. F. 10. Edited by D. M. GRIDDALE. (Leeds School of English Language Texts and Monographs: Number V.) 1939. Pp. xxx + 111. 7s. 6d.

ONE of the immediate needs in M.E. studies at the moment is for publication of some of the vast material to which Dr. Owst has called attention in his two well-known books. The texts now made accessible by Miss Grisdale are moderately interesting specimens of the English sermon of the later mediæval period. She has provided a select glossary and a compact introduction and notes; both the latter have benefited from information contributed by Mr. R. W. Hunt, who (among other things) has identified Hugo Legat, the author of the first sermon, with a monk of St. Albans.

The greater part of the introduction is devoted (after an analysis of the structure of mediæval sermons) to a discussion of the illustrative

material used in these three. The reader who is new to the subject may have some little difficulty in grasping the implications of this discussion; they might have been brought out more effectively. For instance, if the typical form of the sermon is that which Miss Grisdale sets out on pp. xiii—xiv, why is it that the third sermon has no explicit divisions into "principals" and "members"? And just how frequent is this system of explicit divisions in the general practice? Such are the questions which will occur to the uninitiated. Miss Grisdale's account is descriptive rather than closely analytical. One or two details suggest that she has not fully understood the stylistic tradition here represented; as, for instance, when she assumes that certain illustrative descriptions are reminiscences of personal experiences (p. xx, paragraph two, and p. xxvii, lines 20-27). Her account of the dialectal features in the phonology and accentuation is brief and not altogether adequate. *A-monge* should not be adduced (p. xxviii) to exemplify the West Midland retention of short [o] as the rounding of [a] before a nasal; only cases before a nasal that is not followed by another consonant are conclusive. And *at* 22, 10, should not be cited as an example of a Northern form (under Norse influence) of the pronoun *þat*, since it is a conjunction.

The notes are reasonably full, and contain some useful explanatory and illustrative material. The note on p. 81 (1:6) does not distinguish between alliterative phrases, in the sense of brief collocations that were felt as a unit, and an ordinary use of alliteration within the sentence. The glossary includes most of the words that are worth mentioning. *Podagre* 30, 281, which is rare in M.E., ought to have been included. *Ize* 23, 32 might have been glossed or explained in the notes; the same applies to *trifold* 37, 513, which presumably is formed on the sb. *trifle*, but in which the final *d* is difficult to explain. *Alenge* 14, 158 should not be interpreted as the present participle of the verb deriving from O.E. *eglan*; it is the adj. *alenge, elenge* 'miserable.'

What with occasional erratic spellings and the lateness of the language, these texts contain one or two little problems that would tax the ingenuity of experienced scholars; Miss Grisdale need not be dissatisfied with her work. It is to be hoped that she will proceed to make more material of the same kind available.

G. V. SMITHERS.

Renaissance Literary Theory and Practice : Classicism in the Rhetoric and Poetic of Italy, France, and England, 1400-1600. By CHARLES SEARS BALDWIN. Edited with Introduction by DONALD LEMEN CLARK. New York : Columbia University Press ; London : H. Milford. 1939. Pp. xiv+251. 17s. 6d. net.

THE object of this posthumously published work, seen through the press by the late Professor Baldwin's colleague, Professor D. L. Clark, is an evaluation of the literary and critical achievement of Italy, France, and England in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The study proceeds mainly by means of a survey of kinds and forms (lyric and pastoral, romance, drama, poetics, prose narrative, and essays). Under these headings the better-known works of these two centuries are "assayed for literary values," mainly of composition and style. Thus, the chapter on romance describes and assesses, with emphasis on narrative method, the achievement of Malory, Boiardo, Ariosto, Tasso, and Spenser. Professor Baldwin rightly finds in few of the works under survey conformity to Aristotelian canons, but, instead, a widespread confusion of rhetoric and poetic and a love of the sophistic, Alexandrian, and other vices of style associated with Greek and Roman decadence. No one would quarrel with these findings. What is doubtful is whether a survey of Renaissance literature was necessary to reach conclusions so obvious.

It must be remembered that, as a professor of rhetoric, Professor Baldwin was less concerned with the interpretation of literature than with the teaching of composition. The results of so professional and partial an approach to Renaissance literature are, however, unfortunate. For example, because of its neglect of narrative progress in the pursuit of "schemes," Lyly's work appears of no greater significance than that of Pettie or Greene.

The book has undoubtedly suffered from the fact that it was unfinished when Professor Baldwin died. Had he lived to complete and revise it, it would undoubtedly have gained in coherency. As it stands, it vacillates between a literary history and an analysis of critical theory, and successive chapters show an increasing lack of direction in subject-matter and aim. For the most part it is inadequate and superficial, though its critical *obiter dicta* are sometimes helpful and its synopses may be useful to those without the time or facilities to read the works themselves.

What is most remarkable about the work is the tendency towards the sophistic in style, so roundly denounced by Professor Baldwin in Renaissance writings. "As Ariosto had begun with *I suppositi* in 1509, so Shakspeare wrote the *Comedy of Errors* in 1591" is a very false homœosis which sacrifices more to a figure than did Meres. The wording of many sentences is slipshod, and the connection between one sentence and another sometimes loose. There is also some lack of precision in the use of terms: "Ciceronian Latin," for example, is equated with "Augustan," and "Augustan" with "classical."

ALICE WALKER.

The Renaissance and English Humanism. By DOUGLAS BUSH.
Toronto University Press. 1939. Pp. 139. (No price given.)

THESE lectures, delivered at Toronto University under the Alexander Lectures Foundation, will put fresh heart into those who, like their writer, fear that the accumulating undergrowth of exegesis on the foothills of literature is rendering less distinct and less accessible the great landmarks. Professor Bush moves well above the foothills. His object is to explore afresh the principal features of that supposed watershed the Renaissance, and readers will find the altitude at which he moves stimulating and refreshing.

In the first of his lectures the ground is prepared by a survey of the conflicting views that have been held concerning the origins and character of the Renaissance. None of these, as Professor Bush shows, will stand the test of the evidence. In particular, he refuses to accept the view, given wide currency by Burckhardt, of its pagan and individualistic character. He sees its humanism as fundamentally Christian and emphasizes the solid continuity of its aim with that of the Middle Ages—a synthesis of the two great authorities, Christian teaching and classical ethics. This thesis is illustrated in his second and third lectures. Here Professor Bush shows how, in typical figures ranging from the twelfth to the sixteenth century (John of Salisbury, Petrarch, Erasmus, More's circle, the mid-century humanists, and men of the generation of Sidney, Spenser, and Shakespeare), the major articles of the creed and programme of humanism remained constant—the fusion of Christian and ancient ethics as a training in rational self-direction and the conduct of affairs. The final lecture is devoted to a study of Milton, the last great exponent of a long cultural tradition whose foundations were already crumbling under the disintegrating influences that challenged

the two authorities on which it rested—the Church and the classics.

A synopsis of these lectures inevitably makes them appear more dogmatic and less subtle and persuasive than they are, and only the exigencies of a review render a summary pardonable. Four hours can seldom have been used to fuller purpose. Professor Bush surveys the panorama presented by five centuries with the experienced eye of one who has traversed the ground, and his sure grip on his subject-matter is reflected in a corresponding firmness of style. His wit, which needs no advertisement, plays happily on many aspects of his subject, and pricks, with cogent relevance to the humanistic theme, some of the myriad bubbles of modern education—"a gaseous thing called civics" and similar chameleon-like courses that live on air. In graver mood he closes with a valedictory warning for his own profession, "toiling mightily to bring about the death of English," and foresees the fate of English studies "as a somewhat vermiform appendix to economics and sociology." Happily, these lectures show that they can still perform an organic function.

ALICE WALKER.

Edmund Spenser. A Bibliographical Supplement. By DOROTHY F. ATKINSON. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1937. Pp. xvi + 242. 13s. 6d.

THIS volume, which should be accepted by all libraries, is a continuation of Professor Carpenter's *Reference Guide to Spenser* (1923), and, as the record of work done on Spenser since 1923, together with many items not known to Carpenter, is a credit to Spenser studies. It is to be hoped that the completion of the Johns Hopkins Variorum Spenser, which has inspired so many articles in periodicals, will not see much lessening of interest. Unfortunately it is impossible to make a complete index of Spenser items, and the result, as shown here and in Carpenter, is that a number of enthusiastic young researchers are accorded the honour of making discoveries of things known to Todd, Collier, and Grosart.

The arrangement follows that in the *Reference Guide*. This leads to a certain amount of duplication, which perhaps cannot be always avoided, but it also entails the admission into the *Supplement*, under scholarly headings, of much worthless Baconiana, which, negligible in quantity in the earlier volume, is here allowed to assume

some proportions, the net having taken a larger sweep. If it was really necessary to include Baconiana for the sake of completion Miss Atkinson might have been courageous enough to relegate it to an appendix. One other section should have been altered. Since Spenser now has two wives, Section 5 of "The Life" should not be styled "Spenser's Marriage, his Wife." Professor Carpenter would surely not have been so rigorous a master as to insist on the preservation of his arrangement of the material in his book.

There are other suggestions of the timid editor who has been overwhelmed by the mass of material, but on the whole Miss Atkinson has done well, and I would be the last to speak harshly. I would, however, complain of the lack of uniformity in the presentation of new data in Spenser's life. Some items are given in full: others are much too meagre.

I notice some misprints. P. 5, middle, for *Classigny* read *Classigany*, as at bottom. P. 14, MS. Cotton Titus B. XIII. 361, not 364. The error is perhaps due to the peculiar way this MS. is bound. P. 30, near top, the reply by F. R. S. M. to G. W. W. should, according to the system employed throughout, have been recorded in small type below this item; it is, however, separately recorded on p. 31. These two notes, which appear in *Notes and Queries*, deal with the Rev. Thomas Newcomb (? 1682-1762), who claimed to be descended from Spenser. The claim was first recorded in Giles Jacob, *Poetical Register* (1723), II. 118, but this is not recorded by Miss Atkinson, nor is the *D.N.B.* article on Newcomb, which questions the claim. Lastly, on this subject, Newcomb is indexed only as on p. 30, instead of as on both pp. 30 and 31, and G. W. W. (p. 30) and G. H. W. (p. 31, another contributor to *Notes and Queries*) are indexed as one person.

P. 62, the Noel Douglas Replica of the *Amoretti and Epithalamion*, is a facsimile of the B.M. 1595 octavo, not of the 1611 folio. Item 22 on p. 211 is hopelessly wrong. It should have read "Hamer, Enid, *The Metres of English Poetry*, London, 1930." Mrs. Hamer, who published this book under her married name, was a Miss E. H. Porter, and is not, as Miss Atkinson informs me, a "Mrs. E. H. H. Porter," and the title of her book is not the impossible one, *The Metres of English Prosody*. The writer is my wife.

The sections on Criticism before and after 1651 in both the *Reference Guide* and in this volume, are by no means complete, a fair number of easily accessible items having been overlooked. The

index, though large, is defective in more than one way. Principal items are sometimes not fully indexed: many place-names, and even personal names, are omitted, or inadequately recorded. I do not understand the method of indexing periodicals. Some are indexed in full under their names, others hardly at all, or even not at all. If, for example, one wishes to know all the items on Spenser published in the *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archaeological Association*, or in the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland*, there is nothing for it but to wade page by page through the whole volume.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

The Poems of Thomas Pestell. Edited with an Account of his Life and Work by HANNAH BUCHAN. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1940. Pp. lvi+146. 12s. 6d. net.

THE manner and content of the work of a minor poet writing in the early seventeenth century can usually be anticipated with some degree of accuracy. It will probably contain a few lyrics suggestive of Donne, perhaps a few translations of the classical lyric writers, a satirical character or two, some divine poems, a sprinkling of epigrams, and a number of verse epistles and occasional poems written to celebrate the marriages, deaths, and happy or unhappy accidents of the lives of friends or patrons. The poetry of Thomas Pestell, which is here collected for the first time, presents no surprises. We should be prepared for more lyrics and translations than we find, and for less occasional verse; but Pestell's range is just what we might expect. And so, too, is his manner—his preference for the unbraced couplet, his ceaseless concern to occupy his own mind and his reader's with the turns of his wit, and the rude gracelessness of his satires. His intrinsic merit is low enough, as his editor, Miss Hannah Buchan, recognizes; but he is worth having in print for his very predictableness. Here, we may say, is the norm, a standard by which we can judge the size of Pestell's greater contemporaries, and here also is a good example of the effect which such a leading poet as Donne had upon the ordinary versifier.

For these reasons Miss Buchan is to be congratulated on providing us with a first collected edition of Pestell's poems, only a few of which had been printed before. She is also to be congratulated on the industry she has shown in collating manuscripts and in discovering information about Pestell's life, of whom little was previously known. It is doubtful, however, whether Miss Buchan has always given the

best direction to her industry or shown the results of it to the best effect. These doubts are prompted by her work upon the text. She has gone to a great deal of trouble in collating manuscripts and recording variants, and "except for the emendation of an occasional error" has made no change in the spelling or punctuation of the manuscripts or printed works which she has taken for the sources of her edition. As a principle, this is now generally accepted by scholars. But it cannot always be adopted without modification. Circumstances must be considered. The particular circumstance to which Miss Buchan has not given sufficient consideration is the difficult problem of the punctuation of Harvard MS. Eng. 228, which Miss Buchan believes to be the work of Pestell or his son. Miss Buchan remarks that the MS. is "very heavily punctuated." In point of fact, it is so heavily punctuated (by her showing) as to make nonsense of the poems to a modern reader. Two short examples will suffice:

Hee craved wisdome did obtaine, the same
and their withall : an Indian stocke of gaine
Honour did hommage, did attend his throne
riches advand him : more then anyone
Hee gaue his heart to gladnesse & to folly
Not in decrepitt feeble doting daies
When faculties : shall faile. to sound his praise.
Things of concernment : our immortall state
must be remembred : early not to late
Tis dangerous to deferre : vntill tomorrow.
one day delay : may : cause : eternall sorrow

Clearly something must be done about this. Nothing short of a photograph is likely to convince a student of, let us say, metrics or rhetoric that the hieroglyphics after *delay*, *may*, and *cause* in the last line are colons and not calligraphic decorations; and as for other students, what they want is a text they can read, and therefore a key to such freakish punctuation. If, for example, Miss Buchan could make out a case to show that colons are used to mark *cæsurae*—which is doubtful—there would be much to be said for replacing them with a less ambiguous mark, such as a sloping dash (/). But if no key can be discovered and it is still thought necessary to preserve the punctuation in case someone else can discover it, then let the original punctuation be enclosed in square brackets and let a more comprehensible punctuation be added, or vice versa. The result would no doubt offend the sight, but the reader would at least be provided with a text he could understand.

The value of Miss Buchan's meticulous record of variant readings

is largely impaired by their position in the book. They occupy 13 pages at the end of the text, where they run the risk of never being looked at. The student of Milton or Shakespeare might be ready to keep one finger in the appendix and turn backwards and forwards for every line of the poem, but he would justly complain that his trouble could have been saved by printing variants at the foot of the page. What one would hesitate to ask from a student of Milton one cannot expect from a reader of Pestell. But it would be a pity for the reader not to consult the textual notes, for he will find there what he might have expected to find in the commentary, a song ascribed to Herrick which Pestell "patched" in 1636.

After the textual notes there follow 17 pages of commentary, which should also have been printed at the foot of the page. Where there is an antiquarian puzzle to be solved, Miss Buchan can usually give us some help; but where there is a syntactical difficulty, she leaves us to our own guesses. What, for example, does this mean?

Fond Greif at Good menns Graues, a Riddle found
T^t'is Water spilt vpon no ground.
To wish green Fruict : wth store
Of showrs to clapp deep-sayling barkes
And at th' arriuals, rore.
His madd mistake, or more,
That pitch'd ; & watch'd, but wept to catch his larks.

If it is worth printing, it is worth expounding; and if the editor cannot expound it, he should unhesitatingly say so.

These blemishes are irritating. They go far to prevent one from reading and understanding Pestell with ease and sympathy. That is a pity, for it is unlikely that he will ever be printed again.

JOHN BUTT.

Christopher Marlowe : A Biographical and Critical Study.

By F. S. BOAS. Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1940. Pp. xii+336. 15s. net.

SCHOLARS of the Elizabethan period, and especially students of Marlowe's life and work, now owe a great additional debt to Dr. Boas. He has brought together into one book material that had been scattered over enough volumes to fill a bookshelf, has added to it much of his own, and has made a fuller and clearer picture of Marlowe's life and work than has ever been achieved before.

The increase in our knowledge of Marlowe during the last fifteen

years has been one of the most astonishing developments in the field of Elizabethan biography. Until 1925 it was represented by a meagre handful of facts which had been in the possession of scholars for some thirty years, and certain more recent additions made by the researches of Dr. Boas, J. H. Ingram, and G. C. Moore Smith. There was a general feeling that, short of some extraordinarily lucky find, nothing more was likely to be known, and that the biographer of Marlowe would have to confine himself henceforth to judicious conjecture derived from these facts. All the known sources from which anything could be learnt seemed to have been examined.

This state of affairs was revolutionized by the work of certain scholars, trained in archive searching, who combined among them a knowledge of the writings of Marlowe and his contemporaries with a knowledge of Elizabethan history, law-court procedure, and theatre life, and added to those the special technique necessary for handling the material in the Public Record Office and similar repositories. From the work of Dr. Boas himself, of Professor J. L. Hotson, Professor C. F. Tucker Brooke, Miss Ethel Seaton, Miss E. de Kalb, Professor Mark Eccles, Mr. Vine Hall, and Mr. John Bakeless there gradually came together a number of fresh facts which were skilfully assimilated to the existing data until a coherent body of material stood forth, and it was possible at last to write a life of Marlowe which should read as a continuous, if slender, story, conjecture after conjecture having been replaced by ascertained fact.

Just such a life has now actually been written (fifteen years ago such a possibility was not even in sight), and by the scholar whom, of all others, the student of Marlowe would most have wished to see write it. For Dr. Boas was not only at work upon Marlowe earlier than any of us, but has remained in the vanguard throughout these years of steady accession, contributing to the discoveries, guiding the process of assimilation, and summing up, mid-way through the process, the findings up to date (together with some additional data of his own discovering) in his *Marlowe and his Circle* (1929).

The present volume is the fruit of these years of discovery, sifting and allocating of material. It brings together all the established facts and all the most reasonable conjectures which are dispersed through twenty-one more volumes, articles, and correspondence. Coming at the end of a long series, it can omit conjectures—inevitable at one stage, but corrected or adjusted by the discovery of fresh fact at another stage—and thus tell the story, as none of the preceding writers

could, not only as a continuous whole, but using the more recently discovered facts to support or interpret those that had come to light in the earlier stages of this fresh exploration. The result is a book in which the sum of what is known up to the present day is set out lucidly and in due proportion, a thing which has not been attempted by anyone but Dr. Boas himself in his preliminary volume of 1929 and Professor Tucker Brooke in his *Life of Marlowe* (1931). And since then much fresh fact has been discovered.

But this, valuable as it is, was not the only thing that remained to be done. For in the excitement of hunting clues, of following up discoveries about Marlowe's life—his connection with the Elizabethan Secret Service, the later parts of his career at Cambridge, his brush with the authorities and imprisonment in Newgate, his associates and his quarrels, the grounds for the charge of atheism brought against him, and the still mysterious circumstances of his death—there is a slight danger that we may overlook the starting-point itself of our interest in him, the fact that he was a great poet. Prosecutions, brawls, evidence of Secret Service activities—all these are of significance only in so far as they give us some contributory knowledge of the man who was also something far more than any or all of these events indicate.

And it is here that we may be glad that the task of writing the first full life of Marlowe has fallen to a scholar who, sound and detailed as is his scholarship, is no mere antiquary, but one who was first attracted to Marlowe by that in him which is of eternal significance, and not merely by the fact that his life offered one of the unsolved puzzles of Elizabethan biography. Dr. Boas's book, as its sub-title shows, is not pure biography: it is also a "critical study." It is, in fact, both simultaneously. It relates the life to the works and the works to the life, illuminating each by each, in a way which could only be done by one who has been equally conversant over a long period of time with both the growing body of biographical fact and the permanent body of imperishable poetry. Thus the chapters interlock. First come those on Canterbury and Cambridge, summing up all that is now known of these earliest phases of Marlowe's life and experience. Then follow chapters written in the light of this knowledge (not refusing a ray now and again from what we now know of Marlowe's later career) on his earliest writings, from the classical translations, through *Dido* (which Dr. Boas convincingly ascribes almost entirely to Marlowe rather than to the joint authorship

of Marlowe and Nashe)¹ and so on to the two parts of *Tamburlaine*. The phase of Marlowe's life in London, with the mass of material recently recovered, now follows; then we come to the association with Robert Poley, to the later plays, culminating (as Dr. Boas again argues convincingly, though some of us still do our best to evade conviction) in *Dr. Faustus*. The study of the poems follows, and then two interesting chapters—one on "Marlowe's Accusers," the contemporary attacks upon him, and one on the charge of atheism brought against him, Chomley, and Raleigh. The next two chapters cover the account of his death and sum up the careful investigations that have been made into the subsequent fate of his associates. This is followed by invaluable surveys of the biographical accounts of Marlowe from his own to the present day, and of the principal documents and early editions.

It is impossible to indicate in this brief space more than a part of the most interesting critical material, but special reference should be made to the passages which trace Marlowe's relation to and treatment of his sources, and the light this may throw on problems of text, date, and authorship² and the examination of the problems surrounding *The First Part of the Contention* and *The True Tragedy* and of "the case for Marlowe's authorship of *Arden of Feversham*."³ Careful attention should be given throughout to Dr. Boas's investigation of the extent and quality of classical influence on Marlowe, as well as to the chapter which specially considers it. There is, further, the valuable appendix to Chapter X, "The Collier Leaf of *The Massacre at Paris*."⁴

This book is, if I may be permitted to say so, a fine service done to a worthy subject, and rendered (as does not always so fortunately happen) by the man who, of all others, has most right to speak.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR.

Seventeenth Century Studies. Second Series. By Members of the Graduate School University of Cincinnati. Edited by ROBERT SHAFER. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford. 1937. Pp. x+285. \$3.50; 16s. net.

IN his preface to the First Series of *Seventeenth Century Studies*,

¹ See pp. 49-51.

² See pp. vi, 52-65, 75-87, 88-100, 131-44, 148-50, 153-67, 174-91, 203-17, 227-33.

³ See pp. vii, 192-7, 198-200.

⁴ See pp. 168-71.

published in 1933, Professor Shafer explained that the essays, which his pupils produce under his guidance and which he selects for publication, are mainly concerned with the intellectual background to the writings of the authors discussed. He is a little hard on those with whom he disagrees. Dr. Inge was taken to task for saying that "the affiliation of ideas is, on the whole, a tiresome and unprofitable quest," and in the new series some remarks by Professor Bonamy Dobrée are quoted as an example of the "extreme silliness" of the conventional attitude to Jeremy Collier. Such reflections may create a little hostility in a reader.

The present series contains three theses. The first is on Francis Osborn's *Advice to a Son*, the second on Dryden's plays, and the third on Collier's *Essays*. The first two are chiefly occupied with the search for Hobbism. It is not difficult to find parallel passages in *Leviathan* and the writings of Dryden, but how far Dryden can be considered a serious disciple of Hobbes is another matter. Dr. Mildred E. Hartsock has gone through his plays with care and has pointed out a number of similarities between the philosopher and the poet. Aubrey, indeed, says that Dryden "oftentimes makes use of his doctrine in his plays." But it seems to me that Miss Hartsock takes it all a little too literally. The characters in the Heroic plays behave so absurdly and express such extravagant sentiments that one cannot believe that their authors intended them to be taken seriously. Whether one agrees with Hobbes or not, and the present state of the world makes it a little difficult to refute him, he was at least a serious and reasonably consistent thinker. The Heroic plays reduce his philosophy to nonsense, which it is not. As I have pointed out elsewhere, objection was taken at the time to the depicting of "heroic" love and honour as being harmful to the young, and the "heroic" virtues may, in a vague way, be regarded as receiving countenance from Hobbes. It is very doubtful, however, if Dryden gave serious thought to his philosophy. The ideas embodied in *Leviathan* were in the air, and as they were convenient for dramatic purposes they served Dryden well enough.

Osborn's *Advice to a Son*, 1656, was very popular in its day, though it seems now one of the least interesting books of advice written for the guidance of youth. It had not the force, as prose, to enable it to survive the new style of writing, and the advice given is not specific enough to catch one's attention for its own sake. Dr. Betz finds the influence of Hobbes to be strong. Osborn, for

instance, like Hobbes, had a poor opinion of Oxford and Cambridge. Dr. Betz also discusses the possible use made of the *Advice* by Chesterfield.

Jeremy Collier was a formidable person and his little known *Essays* are well worth study. Dr. Kathleen Ressler discusses them with learning and points out the relationship of Collier's thought to that of the Cambridge Platonists and other seventeenth-century writers.

HUGH MACDONALD.

The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift. Edited by HERBERT DAVIS. Volume the Second: Bickerstaff Papers and Pamphlets on the Church. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1939. Pp. xl+299. 12s. net.

No arrangement of Swift's works, whether governed by subject-matter or time of writing, or by combination and adjustment of these two, can give wholly satisfactory results. The eighteenth-century editors, in whose hands the number of volumes containing the *Works* increased from four to nineteen, gradually introduced some order into the medley of accretions, but the haphazard growth of their collections remained apparent to the last. Neither the task of grouping nor that of dividing genuine writings from doubtful attributions or the obviously spurious was attempted with sufficient diligence. In 1801 Nichols could not be troubled to bring together the *Tatler* papers he attributed to Swift, content to leave it to the reader to find some in vol. v and others in xviii; pamphlets on the same subject and written about the same time may, or may not, be grouped; and the poems are dispersed, on no intelligible system, over four volumes. Even the index, running to over 150 pages, affords amusement or exasperation as often as guidance to the whereabouts of separate pieces.

Professor Davis, in his edition of Swift's *Prose Works*, follows a stricter chronological sequence than earlier editors have seen fit to adopt. The advantage is already manifest, and will become more apparent as subsequent volumes are published. For example, the matter contained in his second volume is divided in the preceding edition of Swift's prose writings, that of Temple Scott, over vols. i, iii, and ix. Biographically the contents belong, for the most part, to Swift's visit to England which lasted from November 1707 to June 1709. During that visit he became the associate of Addison,

Steele, and the wits of the day. But it closed in disappointment. He returned to Ireland baffled of success in soliciting the remission of the first-fruits for the Irish clergy; troubled at the indifference of his Whig patrons to the interests of the Church; and conscious that hopes of his own advancement must be deferred. He was over forty years old, his worldly fortune unremarkable, and his future uncertain. It is to this period that those writings belong which Professor Davis has gathered in his second volume.

We begin with a group of papers on religion and the Church, the straightforward *Sentiments of a Church-of-England Man* and the *Project for the Advancement of Religion*, two vigorous polemical pieces on the Test Act, the superb irony of the *Argument against Abolishing Christianity*, and some remarks Swift prepared at this time upon Tindal's *Rights of the Christian Church*, which were first printed nearly twenty years after his death. On these papers and on Swift's churchmanship Professor Davis writes with insight and understanding. Possibly, however, there is some drawback to the separation of this group of papers from later writings on religion, the Church, its clergy, and the sacramental test, even those concerned more particularly with Ireland, for there is a marked continuity running throughout Swift's work. But the choice had to be made, and, on a long view, there can be no question but that the arrangement Professor Davis has decided upon is the best, and a distinct improvement upon the methods of previous editors.

Then come the papers in which Swift derided Partridge, the astrologer, to which is added an appendix of pamphlets by others who joined in the jest. But for the editor the most difficult problem of the volume was the task of disentangling Swift's part as a contributor to Steele's *Tatler* and its sequel by Harrison. Our only sure ground is No. 230 and the verses which appeared in Nos. 9 and 238. Faulkner made the first selection in 1735 by printing No. 230; and, in an "Appendix," Nos. 5 and 20 from Harrison's *Tatler*, accompanied by a note to say that these two papers "are supposed to be by the Author of the foregoing Works." We know that Swift looked over Faulkner's volumes before they were published, but it is possible that he never saw this "Appendix," added, as Faulkner informs us, "after the first Volume was printed off." However, Professor Davis is prepared to take the benefit of the doubt, and he prints these three papers as Swift's.

The case for and against other *Tatler* papers from time to time

attributed to Swift is discussed in the introduction. The number of these ascriptions grew until, in 1801, Nichols printed as Swift's a dozen contributions, including 66, 67, 74, and 81 of the original *Tatler*, which he had previously rejected. Scott, in 1814, went farther, and raised the number to nineteen. Temple Scott, in 1902, reduced the number to seventeen, but he made no attempt to examine critically reasons for or against any of the attributions, although he professed to "admit nothing that Swift did not write."

If there can be no question but that Swift furnished both Steele and Harrison, over and above written contributions, with suggestions of which they made use, we have no indubitable proof of the extent of his direct share in their publications. In the preface to his first volume Professor Davis declared it his intention to exclude from the canon of Swift any writings "which we now have evidence enough to reject" and to relegate to appendixes "all such pieces as we may consider at all doubtful." In his treatment of the *Tatler* papers he has done good service in examining the whole position afresh. The average reader of Nichols's, Scott's, and Temple Scott's editions of Swift's *Works* would have no reason to suspect the authenticity of the *Tatler* papers there printed, whereas the evidence in favour varies from doubtful surmise to sheer guesswork. It is even doubtful whether the two papers from Harrison's continuation, which Faulkner printed in 1735, are by Swift.

Professor Davis has studied his *Tatler* carefully, and he weighs the probabilities thoughtfully and critically; but for the reader who has to turn backwards and forwards from papers printed in the body of the work, or in the appendix, to the discussion at the beginning of the book, it is not easy to pick up the thread of the argument at each turn of the maze. Perhaps a printed table would have been the simplest and clearest form of exposition.

Professor Davis's introduction is, apart from this little difficulty, exactly what is wanted; and, as in the first volume, textual notes and a good textual apparatus appear at the end of the book. In his second volume the editor had more difficult and broken ground to cover than in his first, and he has done good work, more than appears at a first glance, in effecting a clearance. The value of this edition of Swift's *Prose Works*, both for the scholar and the average reader, is in no doubt. The publishers have been generous also in providing this volume with three illustrations and eleven facsimiles.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

The Road to Tryermaine. A Study of the History, Background, and Purposes of Coleridge's *Christabel*.
By ARTHUR H. NETHERCOT. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1939. London: Cambridge University Press. 1940. Pp. x+230. 18s. net.

PROFESSOR NETHERCOT, known for his capable studies of Cowley and Davenant, has here deserted the seventeenth century for the "Romantic Revival." His avowed aim is to furnish a supplement to Professor J. L. Lowes's justly famous book *The Road to Xanadu* (1927), in which the treatment there accorded to *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* should be applied to Coleridge's next most remarkable poem:

What would happen [Mr. Nethercot asks] if *Christabel* were really analysed as it stands, with due and adequate attention to every precious detail, to every preserved revision, to every figure of speech and every association of idea?

It would be pleasant, of course, to be able to reply that the attempt to do what Lowes himself failed to do has succeeded, that the result is a new revelation commanding the same, or nearly the same, breathless assent with which one read *Xanadu*. But . . . Oh that 'twere possible!

The exclusion—save for some valuable but unsystematized notes scattered here and there—of *Christabel* from *The Road to Xanadu* might at first sight seem puzzling; but Lowes knew very well what he was about when he made this decision. "Wherever the mysterious tracts from which it rose may lie," he wrote in a perhaps too brief footnote, "they are off the road which leads to *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan*." Mr. Nethercot, however, was not convinced, and in the present volume he claims to have solved the mystery. But he has not really reckoned with the difficulty to which Lowes alludes in his footnote—namely, that while the Gutch Memorandum Book, studied with the patience which no one before Lowes had cared to devote to it, yielded an endless series of clues to the imagery of *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan*, and in fact forms the starting-point of every important elucidation of those poems, the same proves simply and surprisingly not true of *Christabel*. Whether this is because the Gutch book was primarily a storehouse of jottings in preparation for those "Hymns to the Sun, the Moon, and the Four Elements" which

after all turned themselves into *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan*, while the central matter for *Christabel* was derived from other reading the clues to which are lost, we shall perhaps never know. The explanation seems a little too obvious to be quite convincing; with Coleridge the obvious explanation is so seldom the true one. At all events, this, rather than puzzlings over plot and characters, is the fundamental problem of *Christabel*; and it cannot be said that Mr. Nethercot has gone very far towards solving it.

This volume, in fact, adds very little to what was already known about the imagery of the poem, E. H. Coleridge and others having long ago noticed such things as the parallels with nature-imagery in Dorothy Wordsworth's *Journal* (which are not, after all, very helpful, since the "reaction" might work in either direction), the borrowing of personal and place-names from Percy's *Reliques* and Hutchinson's *History of the County of Cumberland*, the echo of *Macbeth* in "peak and pine," and much else. The most interesting new suggestion here (pp. 156-8) is that the lamp in Christabel's chamber, "with two-fold chain . . . fastened to an angel's feet," may have been introduced into Part I after Coleridge's stay in Germany, and may be a transformation of the odd contraption described in a letter to his wife from Göttingen (April 23, 1799):

What is a baptismal font in our churches is a great Angel with a bason in his hand; he draws up and down with a chain like a lamp. In a particular part of the ceremony down comes the great stone Angel with the bason, presenting it to the pastor, who having taken *quant. suff.*, up flies my Angel to his old place in the ceiling—you cannot conceive how droll it looked.

To this suggestive parallel Mr. Nethercot adds a few helpful comments, but also a few less helpful ones—as that the German angel is "an angel that moves, as the shadows do on Christabel's wall"; and elsewhere too he does not always avoid the "salmons in both" faults which he censures in earlier commentators, particularly Brandl and D. R. Tuttle. That Geraldine is "both second-sighted and second-eared" (that is, sees and hears what is not perceived by Christabel) would seem sufficiently accounted for by Coleridge's acquaintance with the ghosts in *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, without recourse to John Beaumont's *Treatise of Spirits* (1705), which there is not even evidence of his having read. Similarly, while he certainly *had* read the *Origine de tous les cultes*, it hardly seems necessary to assume that it was from Dupuis that he first

learned that the serpent was early used to symbolize the principle of evil ; we need go no farther than the Book of Genesis.

Mr. Nethercot's claim to have rounded off *The Road to Xanadu* must, then, be disallowed ; indeed, the more he tries to copy the Lowes method the more decidedly does he fail. What the book does achieve is something certainly much less important, but not unimportant enough to prevent its being a useful work of reference : it gives a critical conspectus, well indexed and fairly well arranged, of the not inconsiderable mass of speculation and commentary on *Christabel* which has accumulated, largely in periodicals, during the century and a quarter since its appearance in *Sybilline Leaves*. This was worth doing, even if the results are no more conclusive than those of the last similar attempt, E. H. Coleridge's edition of 1907, still indispensable for its facsimile of the manuscript. Mr. Nethercot is probably right in rejecting Gillman's declaration that Geraldine was intended to represent a purely evil force in favour of a view (nearer that of Derwent Coleridge) which would regard her as not strictly a witch, but a vampire, possessing also certain qualities of the lamia, or serpent transformed into a woman. This is in harmony with the mixture of repulsion and sympathy which we feel for the character. But beyond this all is uncertainty. The causes and the consequences of *Christabel's* unmerited sufferings remain alike obscure ; and whether, as Mr. Nethercot seems a little too ready to believe, the poem existed in 1800 in a version more than twice as long as the surviving text, and why Coleridge, though so long confident of his ability to do so, failed to finish it, are questions which look like remaining beyond all conjecture. Mr. Nethercot's answer to the last—rejecting contemptuously D. R. Tuttle's "no-explanation" that *Christabel* is a Gothic romance, and "Gothic romances are notoriously weak in their endings"—is to say that Geraldine's malignant characteristics got out of hand and it became too difficult to restore the balance. But there is little real trace of this in the existing text ; and in any case, nothing can get over the stubborn fact that *The Ancient Mariner* was finished, that it is a "finished work of art" in both senses, while *Christabel* remains fragmentary and imperfect in story and style alike. It is better simply to admit that we do not know why Coleridge succeeded with the one and failed with the other.

The chapter "Reviews and Speculations" whets our curiosity concerning the fairly numerous attempts to continue *Christabel*,

but affords little satisfaction, since no quotations are given. The two or three parodies of the Maginn school might well be left to slumber in peace; but an appendix reprinting the serious, if more or less feeble, efforts of Eliza Stewart (apparently the least bad), the mysterious "V," and the notorious Martin Tupper would certainly not have come amiss, especially as none is readily accessible. In the survey of early reviews in the same chapter Hazlitt gets an unmerited rough handling; his *Examiner* review is not really so bad as Mr. Nethercot makes out, and to quote Coleridge's allegation that "Hazlitt from pure malignity had spread about the report that Geraldine was a man in disguise" without pointing out that there is not a shred of evidence to substantiate it is to do a grave injustice. Elsewhere Hazlitt is most inappropriately described as an "unscrupulous snob." Mr. Nethercot may be recommended to reconsider Hazlitt, taking Charles Lamb's letters and Mr. Howe's biography as his guides in preference to Coleridge's letters and *Blackwood's* blackguardings. It is a little unlucky also that he has overlooked Sir Edmund Chambers's paper "Some Dates in Coleridge's *Annus Mirabilis*" (*Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, vol. XIX, 1934), which shows that the problem of dates is much more complicated than he supposes; we are certainly not entitled to assume, as is done on p. 74, that the poem "was begun, according to the best evidence, in the spring of 1798."

There are a few other slips, none of much consequence. On p. 16 "John Richman" should, I think, be "Rickman"; on p. 19 the Italian Polidori is quaintly described as a Scotchman: the only thing Scotch about him was his Edinburgh M.D. On p. 31, note 12, for "Arnold" read "Waller," and on p. 167, line 16, for "rightfully" read "rightly." There are also some peculiarities of style that one hesitates to censure too confidently from this side of the Atlantic. Presumably "teeters on the brink" for "totters" and "to gag on" meaning "to boggle at" are good American; but one "gags" a little on "well-founded in Latin and Greek," "he avowed his content to accept it," and the like; while one cannot imagine either Fowler or Horwill tolerating such uncouthnesses as "[they] insisted on Coleridge's influence by Bürger's *Lenore*" and "he continued the battle with Jeffrey, charging publicly that the other had commissioned an unnamed person to review the book prejudicially."

R. W. KING.

The Unextinguished Hearth : Shelley and His Contemporary Critics. By NEWMAN I. WHITE. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. 1938. Pp. xvi + 397. \$3.00.

PEOPLE who begin by collecting books for the knowledge to be acquired by reading them often end by collecting them for the pleasure of possession, and a similar change of purpose is sometimes to be remarked in the collector of curious specimens of historical information. Mr. White set out with the determination to correct the common belief that Shelley was ignored, depreciated, or misunderstood by his own generation, and to show how his work was actually received by various sections of the public. He might have proved his case to the satisfaction of any reasonable judge without attempting "the publication in one volume of all that was ever printed about Shelley during his lifetime"; but it is easy to understand that the search for evidence soon began to exercise a fascination of its own, and Mr. White was content with nothing less than to be able to say of his collection in its final form: "The present volume does reprint practically every obtainable known contemporary review or article dealing with Shelley, and it either reprints or lists every obtainable incidental contemporary mention that could be found during an intermittent search lasting several years."

Whether the compilation is actually exhaustive is not for a fallible reviewer to say, but it is difficult to believe that omniscience itself could make any considerable addition. Some of the tests to which it was submitted were believed to be of more than ordinary stringency, and it emerged triumphant from them all. It is obvious, however, that the difficulty of seeing the wood increases with the number and variety of the trees. Some of the journals quoted had only a local circulation; some had only a brief and unsuccessful career; some made their first appearance only just in time to record Shelley's death; and a few, besides being obscure, were conducted or influenced by his personal friends or personal enemies. It is apparent, therefore, that Mr. White's intention to furnish "a sure basis for sound conclusions as to what Shelley's contemporaries really thought of him" may be actually frustrated by the accumulation of rare and curious specimens of criticism. The real value of the book depends on the presentation of the rarities in their true perspective.

The Introduction, though designed to achieve this purpose,

cannot be said to be more than moderately successful. When, at the outset, Mr. White speaks of "the ten years' struggle between conservative distrust and liberal enthusiasm which was to decide Shelley's posthumous reputation," he is attempting vainly to perpetuate one of the more eccentric fictions of Courthope's invention: that "we find a Conservative and Liberal Party in Art,"¹ and can trace them back through the eighteenth century to the Revolution. Even if we assume, contrary to historical truth, that the Whigs and Tories of Shelley's day were Liberals and Conservatives under different names, we shall never understand the reception accorded to Shelley if we imagine that the two parties fought over him as if he had been a Licensing Bill or an Eastern Question. It is one consequence of this delusion, among others, that none of the reviewers can ever be given credit for honest conviction. We must always look for the ulterior motive, lurking somewhere in the exigencies of political strategy. We are told of the *Quarterly Review*, which is rightly given special prominence, that it was "a semi-official organ of established religion," and, in another place, that it "played up to the popular fears and prejudices of the decade." That some of its contributors may have written what they sincerely believed is a possibility which Mr. White has not thought worth considering. The simple truth about the *Quarterly's* treatment of Shelley is expressed in the words of De Quincey, a man of Shelley's generation and a profound admirer of his genius, though a Tory and the friend of Tories. "That bitterness of scorn and defiance," he says,

which still burns against his name in the most extensively meditative section of English society—viz. the religious section—is not of a nature to be propitiated. Selfish interests, being wounded, might be compensated; merely human interests might be soothed; but interests that transcend all human valuation, being so insulted, must upon principle reject all human ransom or conditions of human compromise. Less than penitential recantation could not be accepted; and that is now impossible. . . . In this case the language of every pious man said aloud—"It is for God to forgive; but we, His servants, are bound to recollect that this young man offered to Christ and to Christianity the deepest insult which ear has heard or which it has entered into the heart of man to conceive."²

Precisely those sentiments can be plainly read in the celebrated review of the *Revolt of Islam*.

The *Quarterly's* great opponent, the *Edinburgh*, presents Mr.

¹ *The Liberal Movement in English Literature*, p. 20.

² De Quincey's *Works* (ed. Masson), vol. xi, pp. 354-5.

White with a more awkward problem. It simply ignored Shelley during his lifetime, and the reason suggested is that "to notice him favorably would seem to be endorsing atheism and so furnish the Tories with ammunition against *The Edinburgh*." In case this should seem unconvincing, Mr. White searches out other examples to prove that the editorial honesty was not above suspicion. They are not happily chosen. The conjecture that "Byron's *Hours of Idleness* probably was noticed mainly because it seemed to offer a good rod with which to chastise presumptuous young aristocrats" is enough to show that Mr. White is living in a different world from that to which he introduces his readers. If there was one principle which the founders of the *Edinburgh Review* revered above every other it was the principle of aristocracy. It was the firm conviction of Jeffrey and Brougham that "the rights and liberties of the people are best maintained by a regulated hereditary monarchy and a large, open aristocracy"; and they were haunted by the fear that the revolutionary movement would "in no long time sweep away the Constitution itself, the Monarchy of England, and the Whig aristocracy, by which that Monarchy is controlled and confirmed, and exalted above all other forms of polity."¹

Mr. White is not more fortunate in his other principal example. "The motive," he says, "for reviewing Keats favourably may not have been so much admiration for Keats as taking advantage of an opportunity to embarrass the Tory reviewers." Anyone who will glance at Jeffrey's earlier articles will find that his appreciation of Keats is consistent with sentiments on which he had staked his reputation from the beginning.² His pet aversion was Addison; but he had also a profound dislike of Dryden and Pope, and the whole of what has since been called the "classical" school of the eighteenth century. Even Wordsworth and Coleridge, whose innovations he had opposed, had, he admitted, "a warmth of feeling and exaltation of imagination, about them, which classes them, in our estimation, with a much higher order of poets than the followers of Dryden and Addison."³ Mr. White is mistaken in supposing that Jeffrey's criticism of Wordsworth was "based not so much on

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xv, pp. 505, 512.

² See, especially, Jeffrey's reviews of Hayley's *Life of Cowper* (vol. II, p. 64); Weber's edition of Ford (vol. xviii, p. 275); Scott's edition of Swift (vol. xxvii, p. 1); Hazlitt's *Characters of Shakespeare* (vol. xxviii, p. 472); and *French Poetry* (vol. xxxvii, p. 407).

³ *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xviii, p. 283.

personal whimsey as on the eighteenth-century legacy of decorum." The gods of his idolatry, besides Shakespeare, were the great dramatists contemporary with Shakespeare, whose fame was beginning to be revived after long oblivion. When, therefore, he opened *Endymion* and recognized, as he thought, the influence of Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess* and Ben Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, he could exclaim with perfect sincerity: "That imitation of our older writers, and especially of our older dramatists, to which we cannot help flattering ourselves that we have somewhat contributed, has brought on, as it were, a second spring in our poetry;—and few of its blossoms are either more profuse of sweetness or richer in promise, than this which is now before us."¹

In the continuation the argument is obscured by details of the lesser periodicals and by masses of historical information, not all of which is correct. Mr. White would have some difficulty in proving his statement that one of the causes of the "really dangerous situation" existing at the time of the Regency was "the prevalence of government spies who were in some cases *agents provocateurs*." The imprisonment of Sir Francis Burdett is not "a sufficient indication that anything savoring of radical utterance was too dangerous for the times," for there was, in fact, no restraint upon the expression of Radical opinion. Sir Francis had committed a technical breach of privilege by denying that the House of Commons had the power of imprisonment, and the action of the Commons in sending him to the Tower was intended partly as an ironical refutation of his argument. On a general view, however, Mr. White may be considered to have justified his claim that "the bulk, variety, and range of this material and the particular significance of some of it, especially the poems, should abolish forever the absurd supposition that Shelley was ignored."

P. L. CARVER.

Arnold: Poetry and Prose, with WILLIAM WATSON'S Poem and Essays by LIONEL JOHNSON and H. W. GARROD. With an introduction and notes by E. K. CHAMBERS. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. xxxvi + 187. 3s. 6d. net.

It seems rather a pity that this is not simply an anthology of Matthew Arnold's verse and prose, nor exactly an introduction to the study of his work, though it has an introduction of its own. That introduction

¹ *Edinburgh Review*, vol. xxxiv, p. 203.

deals only with his poetry ; whereas, after all, it is first and foremost as a critic that Arnold stands as a landmark in the annals of nineteenth-century literature, a critic inevitably challenging comparison with Coleridge, Lamb, and Hazlitt, though his criticism dealt more practically than theirs with ethical and social thought as well as æsthetics. Saintsbury said that the new Professor of Poetry might have been more correctly called "a Professor of Criticism." This selection from his poetical work differs not very much from that in the Golden Treasury series, but where it does differ it is so far to the good. The place of honour falls to *Sohrab and Rustum*, the ten pages appraising which, from Professor Garrod's *Poetry and the Criticism of Life*, afford invaluable guidance to the young student of literature. By a happy arrangement, this fine appreciation is ushered in by Lionel Johnson's discriminating study of Arnold's defects as well as his beauties from *Post Liminium*. The editor's introduction and notes make with these an impressive critical trilogy—so far as the poetry is concerned.

An anthology of the prose is hardly a practicable undertaking. The plan adopted seems to have been to choose passages centring in some of the memorable phrases, such as "a criticism of life" for poetry, "morality touched with emotion" for religion, "Barbarians" and "Philistines" for our dominant social types, and the "touchstones"—"disinterestedness," "sweet reasonableness," and the "sweetness and light" borrowed from Swift. But, though Arnold relied perhaps overmuch on such pregnant sayings and loved to repeat them, they were anyhow phrases that told, and most of them have become part and parcel of our mental belongings. On the other hand, he always had a case to make out, and he argued it well ; but this method of citing the phrases and their immediate context does not always make clear his general drift. The passage, "How poetry interprets" from *Essays in Criticism*, is an exception, and illustrates how much is lost elsewhere. Why is there not more from that most practical and illuminating application of the criteria of literary greatness, "On translating Homer," a revelation of the inmost secrets that was a landmark in how many of our lives ?

ERNEST A. BAKER.

Walter Bagehot. By W. IRVINE. London, New York, and Toronto: Longmans Green & Co., Ltd. 1939. Pp. x+303. 12s. 6d. net.

It was as a writer on political and economic theory and practice that Bagehot made a great hit three-quarters of a century ago and is still chiefly read. His literary criticism was only an avocation, and, as he too severely regarded the literature of his own time, of a "casual character" and put forward as only "temporary and fragmentary." But Professor Irvine is right in devoting to it most of his space and attention, although he premises that these essays contain "more careless thought . . . more truth and more error than any of Bagehot's other writings." At any rate, this book has the merit of sending one back again with a new zest to the three volumes of *Literary Studies*, and more particularly to the one in which Dickens and Thackeray are compared, with their relations to Fielding and Sterne, Macaulay and Milton are acutely assessed; and Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning are very sophistically taken as exemplars of "Pure, Ornate, and Grotesque art." Ample biographical material exists, and Mrs. Russell Barrington's life of Bagehot remains an adequate authority. But there is room for this summing up of the man's contribution to thought on several momentous subjects. It is a study in Bagehot's own manner, penetrating, illuminating, but also speculative and rather unsafe in its generalizations, and not more successful than Bagehot was in attaining that balance which is the essential character of what he called a "symmetrical mind." The style, too, is like Bagehot's, which according to Professor Irvine was deliberately or instinctively modelled on Hazlitt's.

It is contended that Bagehot coveted power more than literary eminence. The circumstances of his birth and, still more, a very fortunate marriage gave him a most invaluable experience of society and of the political world. He failed repeatedly to get into Parliament; but in his talk and in his writings he showed an easy command of both principles and their practical application or misapplication which is very obvious in his studies of affairs, but not less apparent in his novel handling of the great writers. He was accused of being "hyper-critical about women." He was hypercritical about a good many other things, including statesmen and authors. Professor Irvine lays stress on the coherence of his ideas on literature and criticism; though so disjointed and "casual," his views "hang

so well together." That, however, is not the general impression left by this book, the fault of which is rather that it is as hypercritical as Bagehot himself. The reader will not go all the way with some of the arguments submitted ; but, avoiding some of the conclusions, will be left with a higher opinion of Bagehot's mind and work than is explicitly admitted here.

ERNEST A. BAKER.

The Oxford Book of English Verse, 1250-1918. Chosen and Edited by Sir ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH. (New Edition.) Oxford : at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. xxviii + 1,172. 8s. 6d. net on Ordinary Paper, 10s. net on India Paper.

ONE may begin with some statistics : the original edition of this book, published in 1900, contained 883 poems (or, more accurately, numbers) and 1,058 pages of verse ; the present edition contains 967 numbers and 1,141 pages of verse. A hundred poems that were in the original edition have been excluded, and a hundred and eighty-four poems have been added. The closing date is Armistice Day, 1918, although a few later numbers have been admitted by poets who had by then reached maturity.

Before venturing a few remarks upon the exclusions and additions and upon the collection in general, it is fitting to acknowledge that the *Oxford Book of English Verse* is not only a classic but almost a national institution. It has confirmed, and will continue to confirm, generations of readers whom Palgrave's *Golden Treasury* has initiated. Having moderated with Palgrave and graduated with Sir Arthur,

*The world is all before them, where to choose
Their place of rest, and Providence their guide.*

Let all of us, before we rush in with our criticisms and suggestions for improvement, try to recall how many great poems even by great poets we read there for the first time, and how many excellent poems by minor or neglected poets, which otherwise, perhaps, we should never have read at all. "The best is the best, though a hundred judges have declared it so ; nor had it been any feat to search out and insert the second-rate merely because it happened to be recondite" : so wrote Sir Arthur in his original preface, and it behoves the critic who may feel that he has sometimes inserted the second-best rather than the best, or that he has even been imposed

upon, now and then, by the second-rate, to imitate him in his endeavour to be catholic rather than cathecastic, to subordinate his own idiosyncrasies to the *consensus gentium*.

Three more numbers have been added from the Middle English lyrics and three from the anonymous lyrics of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries : one could wish that there were more of them, but this, doubtless, like other wishes, would require for its satisfaction two volumes instead of one. The rejection of Chaucer's *Merciles Beaute* from the little handful of his lyrics in favour of an extract entitled *The Complaint of Troilus* was perhaps not altogether happy. The decision as to whether the short extract from *Piers Plowman* is the best that could have been chosen may be left to others. The excellent selection of anonymous poems from the Elizabethan Song-Books and Miscellanies remains unchanged, except for the addition of Campion's *Tune thy music to thy heart* (No. 68), which should have been included in the later section (Nos. 178-186) devoted to this poet ; but a place might surely have been found for *Absence, hear thou my protestation*, if, as one would like to believe, Sir Arthur has only excluded it from his meagre selection from Donne because he no longer believes that Donne wrote it. Peele's *When as the rye reach to the chin* is a most welcome addition, but why, oh why, have we not all four songs from Nashe's *Summer's Last Will and Testament* instead of, as before, only two ? With Shakespeare's lyrics and sonnets, as they say in the world of salesmanship, you can't go wrong ; but one is sorry to say goodbye to Jonson's *Farewell to the World*. So far, within the limits allotted, one feels that, although others might have done differently, none could have done better, and few as well : it is when he comes to the so-called metaphysical poets that Sir Arthur first goes seriously wrong. Crashaw, Marvell (*The Definition of Love* is a most welcome addition), and Cowley are well and adequately represented, but is Donne adequately represented by *Stay, O Sweet, and do not rise !*, *Go and catch a falling star*, *The Apparition*, *The Ecstasy* (now, happily, given complete), *The Dream*, *The Funeral*, and the sonnet *Death, be not proud* ? *The Apparition*, it is true, has been added, but two poems have been excluded, and one of them, sad to relate, is the *Hymn to God the Father*. Is Donne, who is represented by seven poems, a less important poet than John Fletcher, who is represented by thirteen (three of them putative), or than Herrick, who is represented by twenty-nine ? Is the *Litany*, to which Sir

Arthur might justifiably have applied his pruning process, a less important poem than Dryden's *Ode on Mrs. Anne Killigrew*?

'Tis all in peeces, all cohaerence gone ;
All just supply, and all Relation.

George Herbert, too, is inadequately represented by the same six poems as before (*Virtue, Easter, Discipline, A Dialogue, The Pulley, Love*). They are beautiful in themselves, and not one of them could be dispensed with, but they can mean far more if their proper background is suggested. Taken by themselves, they tend to confirm the popular impression of Herbert as a mild, pious, and contented Anglican, musing in a rectory garden with a flower in his hand. The addition of *Affliction, The Pearl, The Quip, The Collar, Aaron, Justice*, and, perhaps, one or two more poems, would supply what is now missing—"a picture of the many spiritual conflicts that have past betwixt God and my Soul, before I could subject mine to the will of *Jesus my Master*." The significance of Herbert's experience then ceases to be merely personal and particular and valid only for the devout Anglican, and becomes, like those of Milton the Puritan and Hopkins the Catholic, near and native to the heart of man ; symbolic of all conflicts which precede and often follow the attempt to acquiesce in the sacrifice of material for spiritual, of visible for invisible, goods. Vaughan fares better than he did before, but still not too well. He is now represented by six numbers. An abbreviated version of *The Night* has been added, which, unfortunately, compels one to protest against an abuse of that often well-applied principle which Sir Arthur announced in his original preface : " I have often excised weak or superfluous stanzas when sure that excision would improve ; and have not hesitated to extract a few stanzas from a long poem when persuaded that they could stand alone as a lyric." For five of the nine stanzas of this poem have been omitted, including the second, which declares how Nicodemus

Did at mid-night speak with the Sun !

the fourth, which describes the meeting-place

*Where trees and herbs did watch and peep
And wonder, while the Jews did sleep.*

and the fifth and sixth, with their exquisite apostrophes to night :

*Christs progress and his prayer time ;
The hours to which high Heaven doth chime.*

Gods silent, searching flight : . . .

*His knocking time ; The souls dumb watch,
When Spirits their fair kinred catch.*

A number has been added entitled *Nature, Man, Eternity*, which includes a justifiably abbreviated version of *The Bird*, a complete version of *Man*, and a quite unjustifiably abbreviated version of that sombre and splendid poem *The World*, which Sir Arthur, having carefully abstracted from it its main subject, entitles *Eternity*.

The selection from Milton remains unchanged. Five sonnets are given, but one badly misses *On being arrived at twenty-three years of age, When the Assault was intended to the City, On the late Massacre in Piedmont, and To the Lord General Cromwell*. Although one of the functions of an anthologist, which Sir Arthur admirably discharges, is to rescue neglected treasure from Time's wallet, one cannot include too many major poems by major poets ; for our perpetual under-sense of the poet's genius and of the vastness of his achievement gives to such poems a unity and a significance which the exceptional successes of minor poets can hardly possess : they shine with a reflected light, they share the strength of their content.

The inadequate selection from Dryden remains substantially unchanged. As before, the *Ode on Mrs. Anne Killigrew* appears, while *Alexander's Feast* does not, and there follow *A Song for St. Cecilia's Day* and three songs, (*Ah, how sweet it is to love !* having been replaced by *No, no, poor suff'ring Heart*). Dryden, admittedly, is seldom at his best in lyrical measures, but there is far more of his power in the latter part of *The Secular Masque* and in the superb eighth stanza of his pindaric paraphrase of the twenty-ninth ode of Horace's third book (*Happy the Man, and happy he alone*) than in these three rather hollow songs, which almost any contemporary poet might have written. But it is in the couplet that his real strength lies, and of this no specimens are given. If extracts from *Absalom and Achitophel* or from the more personal utterances in *The Hind and the Panther* were forbidden by the scheme (which, nevertheless, has not forbidden extracts from *Paradise Lost*, from the Introduction to the first canto of *Marmion*, and from *The Lay of the Last Minstrel*), did not the lines *To my dear Friend, Mr. Congreve, To the Memory of Mr. Oldham*, or the first twenty-two lines of the Prologue to *Aureng-Zebe* lie ready to hand ? It is true that Sir Arthur has told us that " the numbers chosen are either lyrical or

epigrammatic," but his conception of what is lyrical and what is not has not forbidden the inclusion of Pope's *Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady*. Is one wrong in seeming to detect here some trace of lingering romantic prejudice against the poetry of "an age of prose and reason"?

The selection from Gray includes, as before, the *Elegy*; a vandalistically truncated version of *The Bard*, entitled *The Curse Upon Edward*, and consisting of the second strophe, antistrophe, and epode, and the first four lines of the third strophe; *The Progress of Poesy*, and the *Ode on a Favourite Cat*. One must regret the absence of the odes *On the Spring* and *On a Distant Prospect of Eton College*, for, in spite of their defective diction, they have character; they are fragrant with Gray's gentle melancholy, "or rather Leucocholy," and with his self-deprecating humour, and they contain phrases which linger in the memory long after many of the too frequent minor poems in the later pages of this book have been forgotten:

*To Contemplation's sober eye
Such is the race of Man . . .*

Collins also appears as before, that is to say, with four poems. Much might well have been omitted to make room for *The Passions* and the *Ode on the Poetical Character*.

The selections from the greater romantic poets remain as they were. Wordsworth, as is fitting, is liberally represented, but one could wish that there were even more of him. He is the anthologist's golden opportunity, for the vast amount of second-rate work he produced, much of it a not improper topic for irreverent mirth, is often in danger of obscuring the fact that he still remains the greatest English poet since Milton.

Wordsworth, thou shouldst be living at this hour!

one exclaims when, in these dark days, one turns to the *Sonnets Dedicated to Liberty*. What nonsense they make of the objection that politics is not a fit subject for poetry, and, one might add, what nonsense of almost all the political poetry that has been written since! Perhaps because of Sir Arthur's complaint in his new preface, that modern poets are not "heartening the crew with auspices of daylight," one is tempted to express the wish that he had given Wordsworth still more opportunity to do it for them, and had added to the eighteen sonnets he has included *To Toussaint*

L'Ouverture ; *Thoughts of a Briton on the Subjugation of Switzerland* ; *There is a bondage which is worse to bear* ; *These times touch money'd Worldlings with dismay* ; *England ! the time has come when thou shouldst wean* ; *November, 1806 (Another year !—another deadly blow !)* ; *Indignation of a high-minded Spaniard* ; *Here pause : the poet claims at least this praise*. Of sonnets in a different mood, one misses that on King's College Chapel.

In the rather small selection from Byron one especially misses the sonnet on Chillon. Shelley is well represented, but one regrets the omission of the *Lines Written among the Euganean Hills*, *The Recollection*, and, perhaps, *With a Guitar*, for any one of which *Remorse* could well have been spared.

William Barnes, whose rightful position Hardy's volume of selections should have done something to establish, receives only three poems ; of these the undialectal *Mater Dolorosa* is quite uncharacteristic, while *Evening and Maidens*, which has been added, is not one of his best. It is a pity that Tennyson, who is otherwise well represented, should have been deprived of eleven of the twelve lyrics from *In Memoriam* originally assigned to him. *Crossing the Bar* has been added, but one still misses "*Break, break, break*," *Frater, Ave atque vale*, and, perhaps, *June Bracken and Heather*, that little poem which opens his last volume, and without which one's image of the aged poet seems somehow incomplete. Browning has been deprived of *You'll love me yet* (whose disappearance one rather regrets) and *Nay, but you, who do not love her*, and has received in their place *The Laboratory* and *Love Among the Ruins*. Even so, however, the dramatic and philosophical Browning, as distinct from the more purely lyrical, is still very inadequately represented. The selection from Matthew Arnold is admirable, and one is glad to welcome *The Strayed Reveller* and *Thyrsis*, even although someone has blundered and inserted *Thyrsis* at the beginning of the selection instead of immediately after *The Scholar-Gipsy*. With Swinburne Sir Arthur seems rather to fumble : a second chorus from *Atalanta*, the one with those invertible lines about

Time, with a gift of tears ;

and

Grief, with a glass that ran ;

and a not very good poem from *Before the Mirror* have been added, while *Hertha*, and, still more inexplicably, *Itylus*, have been excluded.

If Swinburne were to be represented by two poems, they would surely be *Itylus* and *The Garden of Proserpine*, neither of which is here.

At this point the newcomers begin to enter, but, before considering the reception they meet with, one may perhaps be allowed to reiterate one's conviction that the anthologist should try to rid himself of any scruple about including too many of the best poems by the best poets. If the best poets happen to write the best poems, the lesser poets must simply be left to take their place in the queue. If, to take a limiting case, there were room for twenty poems, and two major poets could each produce ten good poems, while five minor poets could each produce four quite good poems, the anthologist should make no attempt at a proportion sum: he should simply exclude the minor poets. He should be quite remorseless, and should take as his motto *To him that hath shall be given, but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath*. Until he begins to approach his own times, Sir Arthur may be said to have fairly observed this principle. A few faults of commission and omission have been noticed, but, on the whole, the proportions and the main outlines are correct, and a foreign reader would be able to derive from this anthology a just view of the relative importance of different poets at different periods. From about the middle of the last century, however, although the best poets are still recognizable and still well-represented, the number of entirely unmemorable poems begins to increase. Sir Arthur will relapse, rally, and again relapse; he begins to offer us withered flowers and artificial fruits, and to be imposed upon more and more frequently by solemn rhetoric. In the end he seems to reveal the divided and embarrassed mind of one preparing a Birthday Honours List or issuing invitations to a Social Function. The result is chaos. No outlines and no peaks are visible, and the landscape, though often agreeable enough, is as flat as the Central European plain. In dealing with the Victorians who died before 1900, although he often seems to rate various minor poets too highly, Sir Arthur is in no doubt as to who are the major poets; when, however, he comes to deal with their immediate successors, his practice suggests that he has either made up his mind that there are no major poets, but only minor ones, or else that he has been unable to make up his mind at all. Having said so much, one must not shrink from exposing one's own convictions to criticism. There are four major poets

during this period : Hardy, Hopkins (whose poems, although he died in 1889, were not published until 1918), Yeats, and Housman ; and there are eight poets who, although they differ in rank and importance, are definitely distinguishable in the crowd, whose work is recognizable, and possesses what, for want of a better word, may be called character, a bouquet and flavour of its own : Bridges, Kipling, Francis Thompson, Chesterton, De la Mare, Rupert Brooke, Siegfried Sassoon, and Wilfred Owen (Masefield reveals character and flavour in his narrative poems, but hardly in his lyrics). What were to be wished, therefore, were that the work of these four major and eight minor poets should be well and fully represented : the rest might almost be left to take their chance. How, then, have these poets fared with Sir Arthur ?

Hardy is given five poems, of which only two, *The Darkling Thrush* and *In Time of "The Breaking of Nations,"* are among his best. He should have been given at least a dozen, perhaps more, for his range is considerable, and, because of the burning veracity at the centre of the man, the whole of even a small selection from his poems is far greater than the sum of its parts. The selection from Hopkins is lamentable : *Heaven-Haven* and *The Habit of Perfection*, though charming, are youthful and uncharacteristic work ; *Pied Beauty* and *Felix Randal* are rightly there, but they are far, far from enough. Yeats fares hardly better. To *Where My Books Go*, *When you are Old*, and *The Lake Isle of Innisfree*, which appeared in the first edition, have been added *Down by the Salley Gardens* and *Aedh Wishes for the Cloths of Heaven*. A foreigner might pardonably suppose that Yeats was a promising young poet who died about 1899, the date of the volume from which the latest of these poems is taken, instead of forty years later, after a career of continuous development. Little short of twenty poems would be required to reveal the full range of his achievement, and every one of them might be perfect in its kind. But nothing in this later section is more painfully astonishing than the treatment accorded to Housman : the *Epitaph on an Army of Mercenaries* is followed by only two poems, *Wenlock Edge* and *Is My Team Ploughing?*, neither of them among his best. Surely Sir Arthur has not, like certain recent critics, allowed a dislike of Housman's personality and attitude to life to obscure his perception of that splendid craftsmanship, concentration, and mastery of phrase which make this poet's best things as unforgettable almost as anything that has ever been written in

English? There are at least a dozen of these "best things," and yet they have been neglected, and room has been found for five quite negligible poems by Mary Elizabeth Coleridge. What was rather light-heartedly quoted before must now be repeated in sad earnest:

'Tis all in peeces, all cohaerence gone;
All just supply, and all Relation.

What of the eight lesser poets? It would seem that the poet whom Sir Arthur regards as the most important since Tennyson—he gives him ten poems—were Robert Bridges. Bridges has written some agreeable verse, it is true, and he worked hard at his craft, but he is too derivative and parasitic to be regarded as anything more than a minor poet. Even to his best work (a very small proportion of his total output) one may apply, with variations, Johnson's saying about Addison—he writes justly, but he writes faintly. *To a Dead Child* and *Absence* have rightly been dropped: of the three additions, *Awake, my Heart, to be loved* is justified, *The Linnet* is doubtful, while the dignified but essentially imitative *Elegy: On a Lady, Whom Grief for the Death of her Betrothed Killed* is inferior to that other charming, but likewise essentially imitative poem, *I will not let thee go*. Some of the other poems included are inferior to *Spring goeth all in white*, which is not. Perhaps Bridges's reputation will finally come to rest on a handful of poems expressing moods of exquisite delight in natural beauty. The selection from Kipling—three poems—might be improved: one's opinion of it may be indicated in the declaration that *Gallio* is a better, and less vulgar, poem than *Recessional*. Francis Thompson's two poems, *Daisy* and *In no Strange Land*, have been well chosen, although one regrets the exclusion of *The Poppy*. Chesterton is represented by *The Rolling English Road* and *The Donkey*, but there should be more of him. Could not room have been found for *Lepanto*, which sounds that "note of valiancy" Sir Arthur desiderates? One would gladly sacrifice for it the long and rather soporific poem by Sturge Moore, not to speak of Hogg's *Kilmeny*. De la Mare's three poems have been well chosen, although, perhaps, *The Scribe* might have been added, or might have replaced *The Listeners*. Rupert Brooke is represented only by *The Soldier* and *Clouds: Heaven, Grantchester*, and, perhaps, *Dining-Room Tea* should certainly have been added. It was only the intense pity and indignation roused in Siegfried Sassoon by the last war that kindled in him enough fire

to enable him to compose poems which, if not great, are certainly memorable, and which belong to our history as well as to our poetry. None of them are here, except *Everyone Sang*, which loses half its power through not being in its proper context. His later poems, though often charming, do not really count. These remarks also apply to Wilfred Owen, the poetry of whose poems is, as he himself declared, in the pity. The *Anthem for Doomed Youth* is here, but at least one other poem, perhaps *Disabled*, should be here too.

Had space permitted, it would have been a pleasure to dwell upon some of the excellent but comparatively unfamiliar poems which, for the delight of the general reader, Sir Arthur has rescued from neglect: Leigh Hunt's *The Fish, the Man, and the Spirit*, for example, and Praed's *The Vicar*.

If, in the course of this review, we have sometimes found reason to complain, it must not be supposed that the burden of our gratitude has been diminished. If the national monument he has erected had been less generally excellent, the criticism it suggested would have been less searching and less severe. He has himself done much to enforce the standards by which he must be judged.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

The Poet's Defence. By J. BRONOWSKI. London: Cambridge University Press. 1939. Pp. vi+258. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS is one of those essays in criticism which, in the words of the late Lascelles Abercrombie, lead to exciting but totally useless results. Having come to doubt the value of criticism, the author tells us that he turned from the critics to the poets, and, interpreting their criticism in the light of their poetry and their poetry in the light of their criticism, tried to discover what they understood poetry to be. This, perhaps, sounds reassuring, as well as original; but, alas! too often it means no more than that the author, finding in each precisely what he wanted to find there, has misinterpreted both the poetry and the criticism of the poets he has chosen to discuss.

At the outset he reveals an implacable hostility to the convictions of Coleridge and Dr. I. A. Richards that the only criterion of poetry is pleasure, a view of poetry which he describes sometimes as "social" and sometimes as "worldly" (the vagueness of his terminology is increased by his imperfect command of English),

and to which he opposes his own view, that poetry is essentially transcendental.

After a lengthy examination of the *Apology*, he reaches the conclusion that Sidney believed poetry could communicate a transcendental knowledge, or virtue, which could influence conduct in the way in which all that was symbolized by Stella influenced the conduct of Astrophel. Shelley, on the contrary, held no such ideal; his real faith was in science, but he "held vaguely to poetry because he liked it." He was essentially a materialist. "Men were not good because they were poor and enslaved. Make them rich and free, and the good in them will be set free" (p. 57). *By their fruits ye shall know them*: this incredibly superficial remark leads in due course to the following estimate of the last act of *Prometheus Unbound*:

There is little more story. Jupiter is overthrown; and the rest of the play is a mild orgy of love talk, which describes the happiness which Prometheus's love has won for man and for nature also (p. 78).

Dryden is regarded as an example of that gradual process of corruption and materialization which culminates in Shelley. He inherited from Jonson a transcendental view of poetry as the imitation of an ideal nature, but, as the result of his practice as a dramatist, he came to think of this ideal nature as being no more than what is permanent in human nature: "Dryden is on the road which leads to Shelley, and on which Nature becomes the nature of men" (p. 103). To comment upon this contrast between the backsliding, but still transcendental and idealistic, Dryden, and the mundane and materialistic Shelley, would be, in Johnson's words, "to waste criticism upon unresisting imbecility." The discussion of Wordsworth is much more satisfactory, especially in its insistence that Wordsworth's theory of poetic diction is subsidiary to his theory that poetry should be rooted in fundamental human passion. Just as Dryden tended to identify "ideal nature" with human nature as it is, Wordsworth identified "fundamental human passion" with that particular delight in the natural world he had experienced in youth. In the chapter on Coleridge the familiar distinction that, while Wordsworth insisted upon the influence of nature on mind, Coleridge insisted upon the influence of mind on nature, is perverted into an antithesis and leads to the conclusion that Coleridge was "mastered by his pride in the life of man," and interested in

poetry only as a field for the study of pleasure-psychology. Unlike his pupils, he knew that he was not really dealing with poetry itself—proof: in *Dejection* he calls his study “abstruse research”! Swinburne is a further stage on the road to ruin: the notion of “pure poetry,” of which he is regarded as an apostle, was a natural development from Coleridge’s “pleasure principle,” and in him Coleridge’s preoccupation with humanity becomes a vague interest in “life.”

The author’s prejudices and limitations are nowhere more apparent than in the chapter devoted to A. E. Housman. It is, or should be, clear to everyone that, in his lecture on *The Name and Nature of Poetry*, Housman, irritated by a plethora of theorizing, was deliberately trailing his coat and trying to make a half-truth appear a whole truth; at the same time, it should also be clear that he did express at least half the truth, namely, that a poet is a craftsman whose materials are words, just as a painter is a craftsman whose materials are colours, and that why certain combinations of words should affect us more powerfully than others is, ultimately, inexplicable. Dr. Bronowski, however, seems disinclined to allow him any truth at all. Housman declared that the quality which drew tears to his eyes in Milton’s line

Nymphs and Shepherds, dance no more

was, ultimately, inexplicable. Dr. Bronowski tries to show that it is not *entirely* inexplicable—that the nymphs and shepherds recall the loss of all Arcadias and the mourning of all poets for their loss, and he insists that this line is only a part of the poem. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Housman was talking about the line, not about the poem, and that what he meant was that

Nymphs and shepherds, dance no longer

or

Nymphs and shepherds, stop your dancing

or any other word order, would have left him cold, just as in the famous phrase

which cost Ceres all that pain
To seek her through the world

the substitution of “trouble,” or of any other word, for “pain” would dissolve the magic. Dr. Bronowski contends with more justice that Housman was trying to equate poetry with that ache and longing which his own poetry expresses: “He is sad because he writes in an aimless welter of standards which he cannot hold

together" (p. 221). Nevertheless, although there undoubtedly exists a relationship between the limitations of Housman the man and of Housman the poet, it cannot be demonstrated by the crude and insensitive methods of Dr. Bronowski. Consider, for example, his analysis of "Is my team ploughing?", in which the poet's last reply to his dead friend's question is

I cheer a dead man's sweetheart,
Never ask me whose.

Housman has taken the last step of self-belittling. He is asking the reader to pity him for being such a pitiable fellow. He is saying "Not only is this a sad and silly poem; there is the untold sadness that we should be moved by it" (p. 227).

This is an exposure, not of Housman's limitations, but of Dr. Bronowski's, for the plain fact is that the poem is dramatic, and that the conclusion is one of those "little ironies" in which Housman, like Hardy, delighted. The statement that Housman's poems "are as wordy and as clumsy as the poems of Swinburne, because the ratio of words to thoughts in them is as high" (p. 228), suggests that Dr. Bronowski is incapable of separating the grain from the chaff, not only in Housman's poetry, but in any poetry whatever, and that he is simply distorting both the poetry and the criticism of poets into confirmation of his own particular brand of pseudo-mysticism.

The last chapter is devoted to W. B. Yeats—but perhaps it has already been sufficiently suggested that the publishers, in claiming that Dr. Bronowski "leads his reader step by step to some very surprising conclusions," claim no more than the truth.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Essays and Studies. By Members of the English Association. Vol. XXIV. Collected by LAURENCE BINYON. Oxford, at the Clarendon Press. 1939. Pp. 131. 7s. 6d. net.

In the opening essay of the present series Mr. T. Sturge Moore defends Matthew Arnold's writings on religion, more particularly *Literature and Dogma*, against the adverse criticisms of F. H. Bradley and Mr. T. S. Eliot, who, in his opinion, have failed to take into account the particular type of readers whom Arnold was addressing. "In fact, Arnold's and Bradley's views were as like as two peas; for both faith was loyalty to the higher and real self by the abnegation of the lower and apparent self. They differed only in addressing

diverse audiences. Bradley addressed his equals in abstruse reasoning; Arnold, in imitation of Jesus, addressed only plain men who felt at a loss." The second part of the essay is devoted to a discriminating estimate of Arnold's poetry and criticism, at the conclusion of which the writer pleads for the early publication of his complete Note Books. Mr. C. S. Lewis, discussing "The Fifteenth-Century Heroic Line," argues that the apparent metrical defects of Lydgate, Hawes, Barclay, and their contemporaries are attributable not so much to linguistic changes as to the fact that their "heroic" lines derive from the D and E types of Anglo-Saxon verse rather than from the French decasyllable, and should therefore be scanned on this principle. The argument, though forcefully presented, involves too much special pleading to carry conviction. Admitting that Chaucer may have effected a compromise, the rhythm of the old native measure running in his ear as he was writing decasyllabics after the French pattern, we are yet shocked to read that he began "his greatest poem with: 'Whán that Ápril with his shóures sóote.'" It is not surprising that Mr. Lewis should fail to establish a satisfactory connection between so hybrid a measure and the modern English heroic of Shakespeare and Milton. Mr. Bernard Groom's paper on "The Varieties of Style in *Hamlet*" embodies material originally intended for the Sixth Form at Clifton College. Noting the distinctive usages of prose and verse throughout the play, the former being employed "when thought is really or supposedly disconnected and in speeches of real or assumed madness," Mr. Groom proceeds to illustrate the further distinction between affected, courtly, and rhetorical prose, noting the consistent relation of style to character and situation. Blank verse examined from the same aspect is gauged by reference to a "normal type, running through the play like a thread irregularly sewn through a piece of cloth, disappearing and reappearing at intervals." The essay is an admirable piece of analytic criticism, and it is noteworthy that so penetrating a critic as Mr. Groom should have a good word to say on the impressive style of *The Murder of Gonzago*. Mr. John Butt contributes a paper on "The Facilities for Antiquarian Study in the Seventeenth Century" which should prove valuable to any engaged in research on this period, and which possesses peculiar distinction in a collection otherwise devoted to revaluation of familiar material. The essay by W. Menzies entitled "Milton: the Last Poems" resolves itself into an examination of the theme, characters,

and style of *Paradise Regained* treated in relation to Milton's other poems and to his state of mind as moulded by contemporary events. Stressing the semi-dramatic setting to the poem, Mr. Menzies concludes that its invisible groundwork, "as distinguished from its avowed subject and supernatural framework, is a scheme of life ideally conceived as stripped of everything superfluous and reduced to the barest possible elements," an ideal which would account for Milton's apparent rejection of Greek culture as stigmatized in the poem and for his attempt at a simplicity of style analogous to that of the Gospel story. In the concluding essay Mr. J. C. Smith draws a comparison between Shakespeare and Scott in respect of personality, craftsmanship, treatment of material, class consciousness, and attitude to life. His essay makes pleasant reading, but cannot be said to add appreciably to our knowledge or understanding of the writers under consideration.

B. E. C. DAVIS.

Non-Celtic Place-names in Wales. By B. G. CHARLES. (London Mediæval Studies : Monograph No. 1). London : University College. 1938. Pp. xlviii + 326. 15s. (paper), 18s. (bound).

LONDON MEDIÆVAL STUDIES has made an excellent beginning in its first monograph. It is well printed, follows closely the now well-known methods and arrangement of the volumes of the English Place-name Society, and breaks new ground. The paper binding, however, is not likely to stand the wear and tear of constant use.

Mr. Charles is to be congratulated on his industry in covering so wide a field. He states quite definitely that this is not a comprehensive survey and that he has not exhausted all the sources of information. How far he has fallen short of completeness, he is a better judge than most, if not all, of his critics. His book is a definite contribution to place-name studies in a field which has been little explored by previous writers.

Offa's Dyke, built in the eighth century, though not a permanent barrier, marked the westernmost limits of Mercian penetration into Wales and long served as an effective line of demarcation between English and Welsh. With the decline of Mercian power, however, the Welsh pressed eastwards and gradually reconquered a wide belt which has remained part of Wales. It is in this belt of border country that the oldest English place-names in Wales are to be found. Some of them, mentioned in Domesday Book, may well go

back to the eighth or even to the seventh century. We cannot, here, follow the author in detail through his interesting introduction, where he treats of the fluctuating fortunes of history in these borderlands, the disappearance of English names, their supplanting by Welsh names, translation and substitution of elements and the confusion of sounds inevitable in a mixed community speaking more than one language. The problems vary in different parts of the area treated and are complicated by Anglo-Norman conquests, Flemish settlements, and Scandinavian influence.

The majority of the names dealt with are of English origin, the most common element being *tūn*. Some of the names containing this probably date from the early Mercian settlement, but it is also a characteristic feature of the nomenclature of the counties settled during the Anglo-Norman period when it is compounded with the name of the mediæval owner of the farm or manor, a late type of formation common only in the south-western counties of England. Such names are Rogerstone and Walterston, containing Continental Germanic personal-names; Moreston and Loveston, from Old French *Moris* and *Lovell*; Griffeston and Howelston, from Celtic *Gruffydd* and *Hywel*; and many others of less obvious origin. Some of these *tūn*-names now appear in a false Welsh garb, e.g. Estyn and Mostyn, whilst Prestatyn also preserves the Welsh accentuation (from *prēosta-tūn*: "the priests' farm"). For the influence of Welsh on English place-names, we may note such names as Gwespyr (D. B. *Wesberie*: "west fort"); Gwersyllt, where the second element was O. E. *hyll*; Erddig, earlier *Eurdicote*, etc. Dingestow is a translation of Welsh *Llanddingat*: "holy place of St. Dingad"; Ilston of *Llanilltyd*: "*tūn* of St. Illtyd", etc. On the other hand, Tre Wilym is a translation of *Williamiston* and Tre-Reikert of *Richardston*.

Apart from feudal names containing French personal-names, names of French origin include Beaumaris, Grosmont, Mold, etc. A few Old Scandinavian personal-names are found in such names as Ramsey, Anglesey, and Swansea and common Scandinavian terms in Axton, Lamby, Caldby, and Steynton.

These examples are merely illustrative of some of the interesting facts to be found in the abundant material collected by Mr. Charles. He has steered his way with care and caution through a difficult and uncharted sea, and all students of place-names will long be in his debt.

P. H. REANEY.

SHORT NOTICES

A List of Churchwardens' Accounts. By LAWRENCE BLAIR. Ann Arbor, Michigan : Lithoprinted by Edwards Bros. Inc. 1939. Pp. 21. No price.

A complete list of Churchwardens' Accounts now extant, with a note of their location, would be a substantial boon to the research worker. This list, compiled by Dr. Blair, makes no pretence to completeness, but even so its usefulness is restricted because it is in the main a repetition of the list given by J. C. Cox in his *Churchwardens' Accounts* published a quarter of a century ago, with some 150 additions made by the author, and, furthermore, Dr. Blair's list was itself completed in 1933, rather a long time ago.

While it would be ungenerous to refuse due acknowledgment to a work intended to lighten the labours of the researcher, two notes of warning should be sounded. In the first place, Cox's list (pp. 44-52) gives particulars of the wardens' accounts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries only, and omits entirely the very large number of accounts whose commencing date falls in the eighteenth century. Dr. Blair's list does little to remedy this omission. Then, again, it needs to be emphasized that during the last few years a new approach has been made to the whole problem of parochial records. The establishment in many counties of local record offices and muniment rooms and the appointment of trained archivists to deal with local records are beginning to have a beneficial influence. Some counties, notably Shropshire, Surrey, and Somerset, have already published inventories of their extant parochial records, including Churchwardens' Accounts, while in the diocese of Lincoln and in Buckinghamshire the necessary preliminary surveys are now in progress. In some counties the excellent step has been taken of housing these valuable records in some central repository, thus removing them from the hazards of the parish chest. It seems clear that no complete list of Churchwardens' Accounts for the country as a whole will be available until all these regional surveys have been completed and published, and until then we must remain grateful for such lists as the one that Dr. Blair has given us.

J. G. J.

Spenser and the System of Courtly Love. By EARLE B. FOWLER. Louisville, Kentucky : privately printed. 1934. Pp. iv+91. No price.

This slim volume, unattractively bound, consists of five chapters. Chapters II and III were originally part of an unpublished section of a monograph on *Spenser and the Courts of Love*, a doctoral thesis for the University of Chicago. So the preface, which also informs us that the remaining chapters have been written at intervals since that time.

These remaining chapters consist of an introductory chapter of five pages, chapter IV with five pages, and a Conclusion of one whole page. Possibly the Kentucky interpretations of the words "intervals" and "time" are rather different from the accepted English meanings. The vital chapters, II and III, are perfect examples of the thesis style of compilation, comment and quotation alternating through 81 pages. The argument is that where Spenser depicts what Professor Earle calls a "worthy lover" the lover's behaviour is indicated by the customs, usages, and laws of the mediaeval courtly love system. The unworthy lover,

like Paridell, follows the advice of Ovid. Even in the first case Spenser rejects the ethical and moral implications of the code, and develops a love philosophy half-Puritan, half platonist, which he maintained throughout his life. This makes Spenser's attitude to love very bookish, and it ignores what must have been the deciding factor, the poet's personal or natural inclination, backed by strong Christian convictions. That the literary tradition existed in Elizabethan times is certain, but it was not peculiar to Spenser, and the writer has forgotten to regard Spenser as a living being.

DOUGLAS HAMER.

The English Poems of John Milton. From the edition of H. C. Beeching, together with A Reader's Guide to Milton compiled by Walter Skeat, M.A. London: Oxford University Press. 1940. Pp. viii + 545. 2s. 6d. net.

The late Dean Beeching's *Milton* appeared in the "Oxford Poets" in 1904. It was one of the first editions of an English classic to give the author's spelling. The veteran David Masson, who lived until 1907, though for himself he decided against the innovation, had observed that some of the peculiarities of Milton's spelling were really significant; and was probably not ill pleased to see the experiment made. Of not less value was Beeching's work on the text, especially that of the earlier poems, where he made use of the small and scarce octavo of 1645. The convenient "World's Classics" edition of the *English Poems* appeared in 1913, and both the larger volume and the smaller have been many times reprinted. Two years ago the former—handsomer than ever, with its fine facsimiles—incorporated two aids for which the great majority of readers of this most learned of poets may well be grateful. These are the translations—from the splendid Columbia University *Milton*—of the Italian, Latin, and Greek poems, and Mr. Walter Skeat's admirable Reader's Guide. This Guide, only a little abridged, is now extended to the World's Classics *Milton* also, and may well help to stimulate Milton study. The price is slightly raised, but it is a generous half-crownsworth.

D. C. MACGREGOR.

Modern Language Quarterly, Volume I, Number 1. Seattle: University of Washington Press. March 1940. Subscription \$2 a year (single copies \$0.75).

Readers of the Summary of Periodical Literature may be interested in fuller information concerning the *Modern Language Quarterly*, of which the first number appeared in March from the University of Washington Press. It contains, as well as the items relevant to English studies mentioned in the Summary, articles on "Some Principles of Linguistic Change in Romance," Villon's "Ballade des dames du temps jadis," "Fifty years of Modernism in Spanish-American Poetry," and also reviews. The executive consists of Professors Ray Heffner (managing editor), Dudley D. Griffith, Curtis C. D. Vail, Frederick M. Padelford, and Howard Lee Nostrand. Neither these nor the well-known contributors to the first number require introduction, and the character and range of its contents make it a substantial and welcome addition to modern language studies.

A. W.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

By ALICE WALKER

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, Vol. XXIV., No. 1, April 1940—

Rashi and the English Bible (Erwin I. J. Rosenthal), pp. 138-67.

An unpublished letter of the Reverend Richard Baxter to the Chief Justice Sir Matthew Hale, pp. 173-5.

A letter in the possession of Mr. J. Fairhurst.

DURHAM UNIVERSITY JOURNAL, Vol. XXXII., No. 1, January 1940—

Re-reading Kipling (W. L. Renwick), pp. 3-16.

Gerard Manley Hopkins : a Letter and Drafts of Early Poems (Claude Collier Abbott), pp. 65-73.

— No. 2, March 1940—

Love and Escape in Caroline Plays (Clifford Leech), pp. 131-47.

ELH, Vol. VII., No. 1, March 1940—

The Romantic Movement : a Selective and Critical Bibliography for the Year 1939 (ed. Walter Graham), pp. 1-38.

Freawaru (Kemp Malone), pp. 39-44.

Early Danish Criticism of *Beowulf* (Franklin Cooley), pp. 45-67.

Literature and the Frontier : the Case of Sally Hastings (Leon Howard), pp. 68-82.

On the work of Mrs. Hastings as a clue to future investigations of Frontier literature.

ENGLISH STUDIES, Vol. XXII., No. 2, April 1940—

The Praetorian Cohorts : a Study of the Language of Francis Thompson's Poetry (Frederick B. Tolles), pp. 49-64.

Grendel's Abode : an Illustrative Note (L. Whitbread), pp. 64-6.

An early Celtic analogue.

Titania and the Changeling (Donald C. Miller), pp. 66-70.

Some Notes on Shakespeare's *Tempest* (A. H. King), pp. 70-4.

LEUVENSCH E BIJD RAGEN, Jrg. XXXI., Afl. 4, 1939—

Het verlies van *n* voor scherpe spirans in de Germaanse talen (B. van den Berg), pp. 117-27.

MEDIUM ÆVUM, Vol. IX., No. 1, February 1940—

Unpublished Parts of the *Ormulum* printed from MS. Lambeth 783 (N. R. Ker), pp. 1-22.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 379

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LV., No. 3, March 1940—

An Early French Adaptation of an Elizabethan Comedy: J. B. Rousseau as an Imitator of Ben Jonson (Henry A. Grubbs), pp. 170-6.

Some Notes on eighteenth-century Essex Plays (Dougald MacMillan), pp. 176-83.

Milton and Edward Ecclestone's *Noah's Flood* (J. R. Baird), pp. 183-7.
The influence of *Paradise Lost* on Ecclestone's opera.

Wordsworth and the Pathetic Fallacy (James V. Logan), pp. 187-91.

A Note on Charles Hopkins, c. 1671-1700 (Alice E. Jones), pp. 191-4.
Biographical material supplementary to the *D.N.B.*

The Dating of Young's *Night-Thoughts* (Henry Pettit), pp. 194-5.
Evidence from the Stationers' Register and contemporary periodicals for the terminal publication towards the end of January 1746.

Revision in Browning's *Paracelsus* (Bernice Fox), pp. 195-7.

A Note on R. L. S. (Edward D. Snyder), pp. 197-8.

A hitherto unpublished early poem from the *Geometry Notebook*, now in the possession of Haverford College.

The Dates of some of Robert Bridges' Lyrics (Albert Guérard, Jr.), pp. 199-200.

Dates, from Bridges' own notes, of about a hundred poems.

Arnold, Shelley, and Joubert (William S. Knickerbocker), p. 201.

On Arnold's phrase "beautiful and ineffectual angel."

Four text-notes on *Deor* (L. Whitbread), pp. 204-7.

On ll. 3-4, 11-2, 25, 36-7.

Arcite's Maying (Henry Savage), pp. 207-9.

On the *Knight's Tale*, 1506-14, and an illustration in the contemporary *Heures de Turin*.

"As by the whelp chastised is the leon" (Calvin S. Brown, Jr. and Robert H. West), pp. 209-10.

On the light shed on Chaucer's allusion by the sketch-book of Villard de Honnecourt (fl. 1240).

William Taylor of Norwich and *Beowulf* (Franklin Cooley), pp. 210-1.

On Taylor's authorship of the anonymous review of Thorkelin's *De Danorum Rebus Gestis* in the *Monthly Review*, 1816.

Source of the Quotation from Augustine in the *Parson's Tale*, 985 (Kevin Guinagh), pp. 211-2.

Liber de vera et falsa poenitentia, x. 25.

— No. 4, April 1940—

Notes on Middle English Lyrics (Robert J. Menner), pp. 243-9.

On difficulties in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century poems edited by Carleton Brown.

A Note on "A Song of the Five Joys" (Sister Mary Immaculate, C.S.C.), pp. 249-54.

On the interpretation of ll. 31-6 of the poem in Carleton Brown's *Religious Lyrics of the XIV Century*.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. LV., No. 4, April 1940—

Jacob and the "hooly jew" (Leo J. Henkin), pp. 254-9.

On the *Pardoner's Prologue*, C 350-71.

Chaucer's Archangel (John G. Kunstmann), pp. 259-62.

On the *Romaunt of the Rose*, 915. A suggestion that the bird was the red-backed shrike (M. E. wariangel).

Chaucer's "taillynge ynough," *Canterbury Tales*, B 1624 (Robert A. Caldwell), pp. 262-5.

English "funk" (Charles H. Livingston), pp. 265-70.

The Basis of J.-J. Rousseau's contemporaneous Reputation in England (James H. Warner), pp. 270-80.

A Parasitical Form of Biography (Donald A. Stauffer), pp. 289-92.

On eighteenth-century brief biographies capitalizing contemporary drama.

Contemporary Allusions in *The Tatler* (Robert J. Allen), pp. 292-4.

Goldsmith and Steele's *Englishman* (Arthur Friedman), pp. 294-6.

The Source of Motherwell's "Melancholy" (Earl R. Wasserman), p. 296.

Motherwell's debt to John Fletcher.

— No. 5, May 1940—

A possible Provençal source for Chaucer's *Hous of Fame*, 300-10 (Robert M. Estrich), pp. 342-9.

Similarity between *Hous of Fame*, 300-10, and one of the *chansons* of Daude de Pradas.

Chaucer's Monk (J. S. P. Tatlock), pp. 350-4.

Trivet's Constance and the *King of Tars* (Lillian Herlands Hornstein), pp. 354-7.

Chaucer and the Liturgy (Mary-Virginia Rosenfeld), pp. 357-60.

Some further Chaucer allusions (Dorothy F. Atkinson), pp. 361-2.

Galloway and the romances (K. G. T. Webster), pp. 363-6.

The English river-names in *Lazaman's Brut* (Roland Blenner-Hassett), pp. 373-8.

A note on "chest" (Lewis C. Richardson), p. 378.

An anatomical use (c. 1530) earlier than the first quoted in the *N.E.D.*

Three textual notes on fourteenth-century poetry (James Sledd), pp. 379-82.

On *Piers Plowman*, vi. 65-9; *Pearl*, 604 (*rewarde*); Barbour's *Bruce*, xvii. 647-8.

The sequence of scenes in *Hamlet* (Leo Kirschbaum), pp. 382-7.

Poetic alliteration (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 388-90.

A reply to Mr. B. F. Skinner's article on "Alliteration in Shakespeare's Sonnets," *Psychological Record*, Oct. 1939.

Churchyard's description of the Queen's entertainment at Woodstock in 1592 (Josephine Waters Bennett), pp. 391-3.

Colley and Caius Cibber (Fred S. Tupper), pp. 393-6.

The Gentleman-Cully (M. Maurice Shudofsky), pp. 396-9.

An examination of the play as a reaction against the hero-rake of Restoration comedy.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 381

MODERN LANGUAGE QUARTERLY, Vol. I., No. 1, March 1940—

The Themes common to English and German Balladry (Archer Taylor), pp. 23-35.

Ecgtheow (Kemp Malone), pp. 37-44.

A new Song by Robert Jones (Joseph Quincy Adams), pp. 45-8.

On a manuscript setting of "The love of change hath changed the world throughout," now in the Folger Shakespeare Library.

Sir Walter Raleigh on Natural Philosophy (Ernest A. Strathmann), pp. 49-61.

The "lost" Canto of *Gondibert* (James G. McManaway), pp. 63-78.

The text of *The Seventh and Last Canto of the Third Book of Gondibert* (1685), reprinted from the Folger Shakespeare Library copy.

Biography and History (Godfrey Davies), pp. 79-94.

Herman Melville's "Tartarus of Maids" (E. H. Eby), pp. 95-100.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XXXV., No. 2, April 1940—

Hamlet's Treatment of Ophelia in the Nunnery Scene (Taraknath Sen), pp. 145-52.

Christian Liberty in Milton's Divorce Pamphlets (Arthur Barker), pp. 153-61.

Wordsworth's Desiccation (Alan Lang Strout), pp. 162-72.

"Ad imprimendum solum" (Betty Shapin), pp. 207-11.

The Source of Shadwell's character of Sir Formal Trifle in *The Virtuoso* (G. Blakemore Evans), pp. 211-4.

Cowley and Wordsworth's "Skylark"—"Ethereal minstrel" (P. K. Das), p. 214.

The Dating of Shelley's Fragment *The Moral Teaching of Jesus Christ* (James A. Notopoulos), pp. 215-6.

NEOPHILOLOGUS, Jaargang XXV., Afl. 3, April 1940—

The Comic Elements in the English Mystery Plays (Frederick T. Wood), pp. 194-206.

Cf. Neophilologus, XXV (1), pp. 39-48.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 178, March 9, 1940—

Ursula Fielding and *Tom Jones* (J. Paul de Castro), pp. 164-7.

A letter of October 25, 1748, from Fielding's second sister to Mrs. Barker, containing references to *Tom Jones* and *Clarissa*.

Wordsworth and Greek (Senex), pp. 172-3.

On Wordsworth's books and reading.

Shakespeare and the Tong epitaph (Wm. Jaggard), pp. 178-9.

Cf. N. & Q., February 10, pp. 96-7.

March 16—

Boswell and the *Caledonian Mercury* (John Murray), pp. 182-5.

Further attributions. *Cf. N. & Q.*, January 6, pp. 3-5.

Notes on Shakespeare's *Poems*: New Variorum Edition (G. G. Loane), pp. 188-9.

NOTES AND QUERIES, March 16—

"Miltonist" (E. S. de Beer), p. 189.

An instance of the use of the word in 1649: supplementary to the *O.E.D.*

Longfellow Letters (H. W. L. Dana), p. 190.

An enquiry concerning autograph letters.

Collins's "Young Damon of the vale is dead" (Earl R. Wasserman), pp. 193-4.

Headley's authorship: *cf. N. & Q.*, October 14, 1939, pp. 272-4.

— March 30—

Thomas Kyd and the chronicle-history (William Wells), pp. 218-24.

Attribution of anonymous plays to Kyd. Concluded April 6, pp. 238-43.

Herrick's Sources (G. G. Loane), pp. 224-5.

— April 6—

The source of another poem by A. E. Housman (Demetrius Caclamanos), p. 244.

On *More Poems*, x, and Sappho's *δέδυκε μὲν ἃ σελάνα*.

Kipling at Gloucester, Massachusetts (T. O. Mabbott), p. 244.

— April 13—

Pepys and "Will's" (Donald Dale), pp. 258-60.

An Interpretation of Milton's "haemony" (Sarah Ruth Watson), pp. 260-1.

Reply from W. W. S., May 4, p. 321; from T. C. C., May 11, p. 339.

The Richmond Theatre in 1734 and 1735 (Emmett L. Avery), p. 262.

Ralph Roister Doister: "an immaculate Copy" (Frank Sullivan), p. 263.

An enquiry arising out of C.K.S.'s reference in the *Nation and Athenaeum*, April 22, 1922, to an "immaculate copy" of the 1567 edition.

— April 20—

Izaak Walton's "honest Nat. and R. Roe" (Arthur M. Coon), pp. 276-7.

Notes on David Mallet (H. W. Starr), pp. 277-8.

Chatterton's Letter from Isaac Fell (E. H. W. Meyerstein), p. 280.

On the "Ode to Duke Harry": *cf. N. & Q.*, January 6, p. 3.

— April 27—

Notes on Inigo Jones (E. S. de Beer), pp. 290-2.

Concluded May 4, pp. 312-5.

An Untraced Drayton Quotation in *Englands Parnassus* (K. Tillotson), p. 298.

No. 169 located in the 1596 edition of *Peirs Gaveston*.

A presentation Inscription by Fielding (Olybrius), p. 298.

An inscription in a copy of Horace presented to Jane Collyer. Reply from J. Paul de Castro, May 11, pp. 337-9.

Izaak Walton and Edmund Carew (Arthur M. Coon), p. 298.

Transactions entered in the Close Rolls during 1646.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 383

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. XIX., No. 1, January 1940—

The Shackling of Accidents : a Study of Elizabethan Tragedy (Hardin Craig), pp. 1-19.

Wordsworth : the æsthetic Intimation (Bennett Weaver), pp. 20-8.

Donne's Letters from the Continent in 1611-12 (R. E. Bennett), pp. 66-78.

Canto Unity in the *Faerie Queene* (Waldo F. McNeir), pp. 79-87.

Pro Ioanne Miltono poeta populum anglicanum iterum defendente (W. A. Oldfather), pp. 88-9.

Emendation of ll. 1 and 8 of the poem against Claudius Salmasius in Milton's *Second Defence*.

Clizia and *Epicæne* (Daniel C. Boughner), pp. 89-91.

On Jonson's possible debt to Machiavelli.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2, April 1940—

Spenser and some pictorial conventions, with particular reference to illuminated manuscripts (Rosemond Tuve), pp. 149-76.

The allegory of Sir Artegall in the *Faerie Queene*, V. xi-xxi (Josephine Waters Bennett), pp. 177-200.

Don Armado and the *Commedia dell'Arte* (Daniel C. Boughner), pp. 201-24.

Spenser and *Much Ado about Nothing* (Alwin Thaler), pp. 225-35.

The Bulgarian origins of *The Tempest* of Shakespeare (Henri Grégoire), pp. 236-56.

The background of "Il Penseroso" (Lawrence Babb), pp. 257-73.

Sir Thomas Browne and the Quincunx (Jeremiah S. Finch), pp. 274-82.

Recent Literature of the Renaissance (ed. Hardin Craig), pp. 283-460.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 9, 1940—

Shakespeare and *King Lear* (W. W. Greg), p. 124.

On echoes of *King Lear* in *Hamlet* and their possible significance for the date of *King Lear*.

Robert Chester (Edward B. Goodacre), p. 124.

Two Star Chamber cases which may shed light on the author of *Love's Martyr* (1601).

J. W. Croker and the *Noctes Ambrosianae* (Alan Lang Strout), p. 128.

Two unpublished letters of J. W. Croker and J. G. Lockhart now in the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan.

— March 16—

Philip Massinger, pp. 134, 140.

Centenary notice ; reply from Clifford Leech, March 23, p. 147.

An author-corrected *Urne-Buriall* (Jeremiah S. Finch), p. 140.

Notice of a copy, corrected in Browne's autograph, in the Avery Library of the School of Architecture, Columbia University. Reply from John Carter, May 11, p. 236.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, March 23—

Suggestions for Scott's Muse (W. M. Parker), p. 152.

Contemporary suggestions concerning his subject matter.

The Minerva Press Canon (Dorothy Blakey), p. 152.

A reply to W. Roberts's letter, *T.L.S.*, January 20, p. 36.

— March 30—

A Landor MS. (Denis Payne), p. 159.

An enquiry concerning the whereabouts of a MS., "A Poet's Dream," described in T. J. Wise's *A Landor Library*.

— April 20—

Geoffrey Chaucer (R. W. Chambers), pp. 194, 198.

Centenary article.

The English Folk-play (Jack Lindsay), p. 195.

Some comments on Sir Edmund Chambers's book; supplementary note, April 27, p. 207.

Charlotte Brontë on Mary Stuart (Davidson Cook), p. 200.

The correct text and twenty-one hitherto unprinted lines of the "Lament for the Martyr who dies for his faith" from the MS. *Scrap-Book*.

The *Kingis Quair* (James Craigie), p. 200.

On the evidence for the traditional date.

— April 27—

Thackeray's Letters (H. S. Milford), p. 207.

A request, on behalf of the editor of a definitive edition, for communications from owners of autograph letters.

— May 4—

The highwayman and his chap-book (A. L. Humphreys), pp. 308-12.

Continued May 11, pp. 326-30, May 18, pp. 347-50.

Shakespearian Comedy (Ralph E. C. Houghton), p. 219.

On Professor Charlton's unorthodox dating of certain plays.

The *Odyssey* and *Paradise Lost* (D. S. Robertson), pp. 219, 221.

Manuscripts of Sidney's *Arcadia* (Margaret Beese), p. 224.

Two unnoticed MSS. of the original form of the *Arcadia* (B.M., MS. Add. 41, 498, and Bodl., MS. Jesus C.L.).

— May 11—

Notes on Jane Austen's novels (M. H. Dodds), pp. 330-2.

Tyndale and Persius (C. W. B.), p. 231.

A possible reminiscence.

Dickens's Diary: an inquiry (Walter Dexter), p. 231.

An inquiry concerning the present whereabouts of the Diary for 1867 and of Diaries other than those in the Forster Collection.

Notes on *Lady Audley's Secret* (Michael Sadleir), p. 236.

An examination of copies of the first, second, third and sixth edition.

— May 18—

Fielding Manuscripts (Robert M. Wallace), p. 243.

A Boswell Reference (Charles H. Bennett), p. 248.

On the source of an observation in the *Life*.

n,"

tr,

ent

na

.

ld.

nd